

**TESTIMONY SUBMITTED TO THE LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION  
YOUTH CRIME AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION**

**August 24, 2000**

**Presented by  
Delaine Eastin  
Superintendent of Public Instruction**

Early in 1999, Attorney General Bill Lockyer and I convened a Safe Schools Task Force to recommend strategies for safe schools and violence prevention efforts in California. Recommendations from the Task Force's June 2000 final report may be helpful to the Legislature, as they are to our departments, in identifying priorities for prevention programs and strategies:

- Strengthen and expand resources to promote building strong, positive relationships between teachers and students and between students and each other.
- Reinforce the comprehensive safe school planning process, including effective crisis response preparation and procedures.
- Support strategies, including community oriented policing and problem solving, to increase law enforcement and probation officers as partners on school campuses.
- Enhance the capacity of the Attorney General and State Superintendent of Public Instruction's School/Law Enforcement Partnership Cadre to provide training, resource, and technical assistance to California schools.
- Provide positive youth development activities that challenge students academically and provide real-world community service opportunities for students to contribute to the improvement of their schools and communities.
- Establish strong accountability measures for school-community safety partnership programs.
- Identify, fund and disseminate information about best practices and model programs for safe schools.
- Work with institutions of higher education, the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CTC), and providers of professional development to include school safety knowledge and skills development in pre-service and in-service programs for teachers, school administrators, and student support services personnel.

In large measure, these recommendations are an endorsement of the work of the School/Law Enforcement Partnership and the California Department of Education (CDE), as they recommend

expanding and strengthening current efforts and restoring functions lost through budget cuts in previous years.

CDE currently supports many school safety and violence prevention initiatives that reach out to our partners in law enforcement and health services. These initiatives recognize that no one state agency has all the expertise to address youth violence prevention and values the collaborative energy that comes from perspectives of many disciplines when addressing school safety and violence prevention. Education's perspective recognizes the importance of the family in violence prevention and the influences in the lives of students that complement the support of the family. Our youth must have the physical and psychological freedom from fear of violence if they are to more fully focus on the academic expectations we have of all students.

Youth development strategies that create physical and psychological safety for our youth focus on the positive connections we can all make with our youth. We must all build strong connections with our youth, listen to them, and give them significant roles in planning and problem-solving, both in our schools and our communities. All youth need opportunities to participate and contribute in these settings. Resiliency research conducted by Drs. Emmy Werner and Bonnie Benard reinforces the importance of at least one caring adult to help an at-risk young person succeed and build pro-social skills. Each youth must have at least one person at school who knows him or her well, to whom he or she can go for support or help.

Building from that body of research, we need to find ways to decrease the size and anonymity of our larger schools, encourage mentoring and "buddy" programs, expand youth-to-youth peer and cross-age strategies, and continue to support and expand after-school, service-learning instructional strategies, and summer programs. We need expanded opportunities where adults can recognize and nurture strengths of students that may not have been demonstrated in a traditional academic setting. Youth who experience more assets, both externally and internally, are less likely to engage in violence, based on a study by the Search Institute. Youth development strategies can and do impact violence by reducing the alienation that can lead to violent acts and minimizing the overall involvement of youth in a range of risk behaviors.

We need to bring counselors back to our schools. California is currently 50<sup>th</sup> of the 50 states in the ratio of counselors to students. While some increase has occurred at the high school level, largely as a result of Columbine, more high school, middle school, and elementary school counselors are needed.

CDE's current safe schools and violence prevention initiatives are highlighted in the following responses to the requests made by the Commission. When addressing this issue, it is tempting to try to identify specific programs and policies that work. Yet, we have learned that it is rarely an isolated program that makes the difference in prevention—it takes a comprehensive school/community effort, and it has more to do with the people involved and the kind of communication and environment that is provided. In other words, the people delivering the program are at least as important in determining success as is the particular program.

**A. Description of grant programs administered by CDE that have the purpose or potential to reduce youth crime or youth violence**

The following list identifies the number and financial support of grant programs relating to school safety and violence prevention administered by CDE. In-depth descriptions of the programs are included in the appended fact sheets. The School/Law Enforcement Partnership between the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Attorney General also jointly administers some grants. Some of the programs listed explicitly address violence prevention; others have an indirect effect on the level of violence that impacts our youth. For example, although Healthy Start has as its primary goal to provide support to children and their families through coordinated and comprehensive services, its overall evaluation indicates success in reducing substance abuse, problems with anger and hostility and disciplinary incidents. Since these behaviors are linked to youth crime and violence, it is likely that there is a reduction of youth crime and violence for participating students.

<b>Grant</b>	<b>FY 2000-2001 Funding (\$ in Millions)</b>
After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships	\$87.80
Conflict Resolution and Youth Mediation	.28
Gang Risk Intervention Program (GRIP)	3.00
Healthy Start	39.00
High-Risk Youth Education and Public Safety	18.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Title IV, IASA)	41.10
Safe School Plan Implementation	.50
School Community Policing Partnerships	10.00
School Safety and Violence Prevention Act	72.10
Student Leadership	.12
Targeted Truancy and Public Safety (carryover year)	0.00

Although not specific grant programs, CDE conducts two other major activities related to violence prevention: data collection and training. CDE collects specific data in the California Safe Schools Assessment (CSSA) and the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) that provide policy makers at all levels with information about trends in school crime and youth

behaviors. Those data establish a means of determining local and statewide program needs and serve as an indicator of overall progress toward safer schools and a reduced level of youth violence.

CSSA collects crime data from all school districts and submits an annual report to the Legislature. These data describe statewide trends and help determine priorities for prevention and intervention programs. CDE typically requires school-level CSSA data as part of the grant application process and the evaluation construct for grant programs. Thus, these data help determine needs and priorities at the site level, and are useful in gauging changes in school safety over time.

Districts also administer CHKS to samples of students and gather self-reported information on risky behaviors, including those associated with violence issues. Like the CSSA data, CHKS data is used to establish needs and priorities, and to measure changes in youth behavior.

CDE and the School Law Enforcement Partnership also sponsor regional training in safe schools topics. Topics include safe school planning, conflict resolution, hate-motivated behavior, crisis response, and classroom management.

## **B. Description of how CDE ensures funding only the most effective programs**

Requests for applications for grant programs are crafted to meet the intent of the funding in a way that will maximize effectiveness, and applicants are strongly encouraged to use programs and strategies that have been proven effective. A guide to effective programming is the “Principles of Effectiveness” required by the federal government of all recipients of Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) funds. The Principles require that prevention programs:

- Base their programs on a thorough assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in the schools and communities served;
- Establish a set of measurable goals and objectives, with the assistance of a local or regional advisory council, and design their programs to meet those goals and objectives;
- Design and implement their programs for youth based on research or evaluation that provides evidence that programs used prevent or reduce drug use, violence, or disruptive behavior among youth; and
- Evaluate their programs periodically to assess progress toward achieving goals and objectives, and use evaluation results to refine, improve, and strengthen programs, and to refine goals and objectives as appropriate.

While the Principles are mandatory only for SDFSCA programs, CDE uses their essence in designing initiatives from other funding sources.

When new programs are opened for applications, the CDE staff usually arranges information sessions around the state to guide potential applicants and to receive feedback on local needs. Once applications are received, staff recruit state and local experts in the particular program area to score the proposals.

High quality proposals are funded, to the extent that funds are available. Only high quality proposals are funded. If not enough good proposals are received, all funds are not awarded.

Following the award of grants, state staff provides technical assistance in program operation and evaluation. The extent of this state support is variable, depending on the size of the grant, number of grantees, and resources available for these purposes.

Throughout all these processes, the strongest predictor of program success seems to be the extent of local commitment. This is evidenced in two factors that are emphasized in most grant processes. First are local resource commitments. Most grants require some level of local match. Agencies that go beyond the minimum in the amount and kinds of match they provide tend to have strong commitments to program success.

A parallel important factor is the community support structure. Proposals that are developed and guided by a broad-based community collaboration are expected by their partners to be accountable and produce good results. Only if local participants commit their own resources and are actively involved in the initiative will a new program model's potential be achieved. Thus, CDE looks for this commitment to fund projects that will provide a fair test of the model's effectiveness.

### **C. Description of the School/Law Enforcement Partnership and assessment of its effectiveness**

The ongoing Partnership that started in 1983 between the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Attorney General has a long history of success in supporting partnering efforts between schools and law enforcement. The success has transcended changing administrations because of its commitment to safer schools and safer communities. The Partnership's primary activities include technical assistance, training, and grant awards.

**Technical assistance.** The Partnership's Cadre is a major technical assistance vehicle. Comprised of up to 100 members from education, law enforcement, government, and community-based organizations, the Cadre responds directly to requests for assistance from agencies needing help in developing schools safety responses.

**Training.** Most recent statewide training efforts focus on safe schools plans and conflict resolution. Specially prepared presenters conduct regional training programs and tailor their presentations as much as possible to meet local needs.

**Grants.** The Partnership's successful practices in awarding safe schools grants and a reliance on Proposition 98 funding for these grants have led to the Partnership's involvement in awarding an increased number of school safety grants. Although many of the grants are small in amounts (\$5,000 to \$15,000), these grants offer school sites incentive funding to implement strategies that potentially lead to safer schools. Anecdotal information, rather than

a formal evaluation, indicates that these small investments have assisted school sites to implement some long-awaited training or make purchases that assisted in the implementation of an overall school safety strategy.

**Effectiveness.** Until 1996, annual evaluations conducted by an independent evaluator confirmed the value of the School Law Enforcement Partnership. The evaluations found strong positive results from Partnership-sponsored training, consultations to local agencies by the volunteer Cadre, and the annual conferences. However, due to several successive staffing cuts necessitated by budget cuts, support for Partnership activities was gradually reduced. These cuts ultimately necessitated elimination of the annual evaluation and the conference. Funds for Cadre members to travel to provide consultation and training were reduced causing limitation on these activities.

The Superintendent and Attorney General's Safe Schools Task Force strongly recommended a revitalization of these Partnership activities. Specifically, they recommended increasing the size of the Cadre, restoring the annual conference, and expanded training and technical assistance, particularly in safe school planning, including crisis response. The Superintendent and the Attorney General have given a high priority to implementing these recommendations. Legislative and budget change proposals are in process to secure needed resources.

**D. Comments on the adequacy and effectiveness of school-based crime and violence prevention programs, including how they are organized, coordinated, and funded.**

California's Legislature has been responsive in providing statutory authority to address safety needs and to correct inequities, and to explore new violence prevention and school safety concepts. For the most part, these efforts have worked well. However, in managing these initiatives, we have identified potential for improvement. Problems sometimes occur when trying to integrate new and old initiatives and particularly in sustaining initiatives of proven value.

California has a strong base of prevention initiatives. The statewide data gathered through the California Safe Schools Assessment and the Healthy Kids Survey show progress toward making our schools and communities safer still. Evaluations are showing the kinds of improvements we had hoped for. We can expect continuing improvement if we at the state level give local agencies the support they need in three areas.

First, local efforts must have consistent funding to sustain proven efforts. We must insist on good evaluation and make funding decisions base on demonstrated results. Many effective local efforts are cobbled together from a variety of resources. Where the resources are ongoing, this is not a significant problem. However, where initiatives depend on multiple competitive or variable funding streams, maintaining the consistent programming need for success is difficult at best. With proven initiatives we advocate ensuring a stable base level of funding for coordination of long-term efforts.

Second, we know from the evaluations of many programs that success comes from integrating the efforts of families, schools, and communities in support of young people. CDE is committed to integrating local prevention efforts. However, it is often difficult to

convince schools and their partners of the need to integrate when they see a categorical approach at the state level. Statutes and guidelines for different programs have different requirements for program content, use of funds and accountability. Not only does this make integration difficult at the local level, but also it imposes a significant workload on grantees with multiple funding. Further, it may impede effective programming. Within our department, and in multi-departmental work groups, we are striving to develop compatible strategies for programs impacting the same populations, to make local integration feasible.

Third, funding for state support of some initiatives is not adequate to provide a strong state leadership role. We are committed to ensuring that public funds are focused on needs, awarded to local partnerships capable of dealing with these needs, and monitored to ensure accountability.

A close look at the prevention programs being studied by the Commission will reveal that in some programs, the administering state agency is provided resources to deliver technical assistance to participating agencies and to evaluate outcomes. Others are not. The Commission, the Legislature, and CDE have the expectation that we will know how public funds are used and the results they produced. For this expectation to be realized, we must have the resources to provide support, oversight, and evaluation.

**E. Recommendations to ensure that public investment in juvenile justice/youth violence reduction is adequate to meet the challenges of rapidly changing adolescent populations**

1. **Best practices and research-based work:** *Most prevention funding should be devoted to research-based strategies of proven effectiveness. In addition, a portion of funding should be devoted to testing and evaluating innovative approaches to potentially add new effective approaches.*

With the growing body of evidence for effective strategies (generally those that involve school, community and law enforcement in serving children and their families in their home communities) the Legislature may wish to focus funding on replication of proven practices. Some portion of prevention funding, however, could be specifically identified for testing promising practices. While all initiatives should have a strong evaluation and accountability component, studies of new practices should have even more stringent oversight.

The Safe Schools Task Force recommended ongoing dissemination of information on promising practices to help local initiatives in program planning. Task Force members identified a sampling of programs for inclusion. Staff is preparing a summary of these programs to be distributed statewide in the fall of 2000.

2. **Importance of partnerships:** *Require that funding for prevention initiatives, including after school programs, be limited to agencies that have partnerships and demonstrate strong links among students, families, school, law enforcement, and community both in designing and carrying out the program.*

Prevention initiatives have the best chance for success when they impact students in all aspects of their lives. Similarly, initiatives have the best chance for success when they

have a broad base of support. Active partnerships between youth, school, law enforcement, and community should be required in prevention grant programs. School, families, law enforcement, and community partners should be involved in planning each initiative, and should take joint responsibility for results. To promote integration of prevention efforts, local agencies should be encouraged to use existing partnerships for most new initiatives, rather than creating a separate collaborative for each.

In designing programs it is vital to engage the entire community, making a particular effort to include the voices of youth that do not have strong links with the school and community. Research shows that connecting a young person with caring adults greatly increases their chances of success in school and in life. It is vital to build these connections throughout the community, to ensure positive after-school programs for all children, and to provide a strong student support team which includes school counselors, the school psychologist, and the school nurse at each school site.

3. **Significant, sustained funding allocations that contain state operations funding:**  
*When legislating grant or entitlement programs, provide staff and funding commensurate with the complexity of the program and the level of oversight and technical assistance desired.*

Studies indicate that even when implementing proven programs, the person delivering the program is very often the key to its success. Programs and strategies in schools may fail, or do not even get started, because there is no one with time to coordinate the implementation, train staff, and provide ongoing technical assistance. If schools are expected to implement programs school-wide, embed strategies across curriculum, involve parents and community members, engage all students, and monitor and document results, they need the resources to provide adequate site-based oversight.

In addition, all successful grant initiatives require some level of support for state staff for administration, technical assistance, and evaluation. It is important that the level of state resources be adequate to achieve the Legislature's purposes in establishing the program. Noncompetitive grant programs with minimal accountability requirements can be administered for modest costs. However, competitive programs with strong expectations for evaluation and technical assistance imply a need for significant resources if the desired purposes are to be achieved.

4. **Length of grant:** *Provide five years of funding for new major grant initiatives and to allow adequate time to test concepts and measure results.*

Most grant programs are for periods of 1-3 years. Where the grant is simply an augmentation of existing activities, this may be adequate. However, most grant programs have the hope of testing new models and concepts. In our experience, with significant new initiatives, many sites do not achieve full operation until the third year of funding. This makes meaningful evaluation of long-term outcomes often impractical. Lack of time to demonstrate results often means that promising projects end when grant funding expires, while the intent of most initiatives is that successful projects will be sustained



with local resources. Major grant initiatives should allow for five years or more of funding.

5. **Flexibility of funding:** *Make appropriations for grant programs available without regard to fiscal year.*

Grant funds are often appropriated for a single fiscal year. In the initial stages of an initiative, this may leave the administering agency with the difficult choice of either funding some promising projects that are not fully ready or allowing resources to go unused. Where funds are appropriated without regard to fiscal year, staff has the option of giving advice and technical assistance to promising applicants. This allows the applicants to develop their program plans more thoroughly and defers funding until applicants are fully ready to implement programs. A recent example of this was the School Community Policing Partnerships grant, which was appropriated without regard to fiscal year. In the first grant cycle, there were not enough fully qualified applicants to use the total appropriation. However, in the second year, there was a large pool of quality applications, allowing for effective use of the second year appropriation and the balance of the first year appropriation.

6. **Evaluation:** *Provide evaluation funding commensurate with scope and complexity of a grant program and the kinds of outcome measurement expected.*

Through experience with a variety of grant programs and evaluation models, CDE has learned valuable lessons on the efficacy of evaluation. Resources needed for evaluation are dependent on the size, scope, and variety of projects and the kinds of measures required. Collection of survey types of data on a relatively small number of similar sites can be done at modest cost. However, where quantitative and qualitative data are desired to provide meaningful measures of outcomes, data collection and analysis costs increase exponentially. Effective evaluation requires funding and state staff commensurate with the complexity of the initiative and number and diversity of sites. Another consideration is whether the grant is to test a new concept or simply to replicate a proven strategy. A recent task force within our department studied support needs for grant programs. For evaluation, the consensus was that survey type evaluations required \$150,000 annually. More intensive evaluations involving collection, reporting and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data from a representative sample of sites require a minimum of \$500,000 to \$1 million annually.

**Conclusion.** California schools have a strong base of prevention programs addressing school safety and violence prevention. Years of experience and evaluation give us the ability to focus our efforts on strategies that work. Our joint goal in the coming years will be to better integrate our efforts for better results. Thank you for this opportunity to provide answers to your questions.



## **List of Attached Program and Grant Summaries**

### *Programs:*

School Law Enforcement Partnership  
(includes information on Safe School Plan Implementation grants)

California Safe Schools Assessment

California Healthy Kids Survey

### *Grants:*

After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships

Conflict Resolution and Youth Mediation

Gang Risk Intervention

Healthy Start

High-Risk Youth Education and Public Safety

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

School Community Policing Partnerships

School Safety and Violence Prevention Act

Student Leadership

Targeted Truancy and Public Safety



## **SCHOOL/LAW ENFORCEMENT PARTNERSHIP**

**Program Description and Goals:** Since 1983, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Attorney General have unified their efforts and resources through the School/Law Enforcement (S/LE) Partnership, promoting programs designed to enhance the safety of our schools and ensure the safety of students. Staff from the two departments jointly oversee distribution of grant funds and training and technical assistance for local agencies. The S/LE Partnership promotes collaborative programs that involve members of the entire school community, especially local law enforcement. These programs include emphasis on conflict resolution and youth mediation, youth resiliency, drug and alcohol abuse prevention, truancy prevention, and gang violence reduction.

**The S/LE Partnership Cadre.** The Cadre is composed of 100 specially-trained professionals from education and law enforcement. Cadre members provide school safety and community violence prevention technical assistance and resource materials to schools, law enforcement organizations, and other youth-serving agencies at no cost. The Cadre has provided more than 200,000 personal contacts for assistance and resources to schools and communities statewide since 1985.

**Safe School Plan Training.** The Partnership provides specialized training to assist schools in developing their mandated Safe School plan, including crisis response. Regional training programs are coordinated by county offices of education and delivered by Cadre members. The goal of safe school planning is to create and maintain orderly and purposeful places where students and staff are free to learn and teach without the threat of physical or psychological harm.

The Partnership's document, *Safe Schools: A Planning Guide for Action*, provides a comprehensive model for safe school plans based on effective schools research. Using this process, schools are trained to develop an action plan, in coordination with local law enforcement agencies, for implementing appropriate safety strategies and for determining resources to be used for implementation of the plan.

**Safe School Plan Implementation Mini-grants.** Starting in 1989, the Partnership provided approximately 100 school sites each year with small matching grants (\$5,000) to implement a portion of an existing comprehensive safe school plan. The grants were competitive and were for a one-year duration. To date 1,100 schools have received funding to implement their plans.

**School Community Violence Prevention Grants.** The Partnership funds 17 school districts to implement collaborative strategies to reduce violence in their school communities. Schools work closely with community representatives, social services, probation, and law enforcement. The sites are funded for a four-year period.

**Conflict Resolution and Youth Mediation Grants.** The Partnership provides \$10,000 to 28 schools each year to establish school-based, comprehensive conflict resolution/youth mediation programs in public K-12 schools. The program requires peer mediation, curriculum integration and school community outreach.

**School Community Policing Partnership Program.** The Partnership provides \$10,000,000 for three year grants to schools to collaborate with law enforcement to reduce school crime and promote school safety.

**Statutory Authority:** *Education Code* sections 32260, 32270, 32290, 32294, and 32296

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** Local assistance funding is determined annually in the Budget Act as a line item allocation to the School/Law Enforcement Partnership. Funds allocated support the following grant programs and initiatives:

- **Safe School Plan Training:** \$153,000  
(The Partnership provides the lead county office of education in each County Superintendent Regional Service region with a small contract to facilitate safe schools training and includes resources for Cadre members to work with the county office of education to deliver the appropriate training.)
- **Safe School Plan Implementation Grants:** \$500,000
- **School Community Violence Prevention Grants:** \$700,000
- **Conflict Resolution and Youth Mediation Grants:** \$280,000
- **School Community Policing Grant Program:** 10,000,000

**Clientele:** The directly-served clientele of the S/LEP program are K-12 schools, districts, and county offices of education and their law enforcement partners.

**Evaluation:** Safe School Plan Implementation Mini-Grant grantees complete and submit self-reviews at the conclusion of the grant year. A review of data indicates the program has successfully assisted schools in implementing comprehensive school safety plans and improving school learning environments. Evaluation components for the other listed programs are described more fully in their respective program summaries.

**Benefits/Outcomes:** Schools can access services from the Partnership's Cadre and training is provided in safe schools planning. Schools may also access supplemental funding for the implementation of safe schools plans, violence prevention, conflict resolution and school community policing.

**Contact Persons:** Steve Schwendimann, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 323-5277;  
e-mail: [sschwend@cde.ca.gov](mailto:sschwend@cde.ca.gov) (*Cadre*)

Vivian Linfor, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 323-1028;  
e-mail: [mlinfor@cde.ca.gov](mailto:mlinfor@cde.ca.gov) (*Safe School Plan Training*)

**Safe School Plan Implementation Grantees  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	Dublin USD	Wells Middle School	\$5,000
Alameda	San Lorenzo USD	Edendale Middle School	\$5,000
Contra Costa	Antioch USD	Park Middle School	\$5,000
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa USD	Dover Elementary School	\$5,000
Del Norte	Del Norte County	Bess Maxwell School	\$5,000
Fresno	Fresno Unified SD	Sunnyside High School	\$5,000
Fresno	Kings Canyon USD	Reedley High School	\$5,000
Fresno	Riverdale USD	Horizon Continuation HS	\$5,000
Fresno	Riverdale USD	Riverdale Elementary	\$5,000
Fresno	Selma USD	Jackson Andrew Elementary	\$5,000
Humboldt	Freshwater SD	Freshwater School	\$5,000
Kern	Kern HSD	Bakersfield High School	\$5,000
Kern	Kern HSD	Highland High School	\$5,000
Kern	Kern HSD	South High School	\$5,000
Kern	Kern HSD	Foothill High School	\$5,000
Lassen	Lassen USD	Community Day School	\$5,000
Lassen	Lassen USD	Credence High School	\$5,000
Los Angeles	ABC USD	Faye Ross Middle School	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Glendale USD	Columbus Elementary	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Glendale USD	Eleonor J. Toll Middle School	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Glendale USD	Richardson D. White Elementary	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Glendale USD	Wilson Middle School	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Bryson Avenue Elementary	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Liberty Blvd. Elementary	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	San Miguel Elementary School	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Tweedy Elementary	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Rosemead SD	Emma W. Shuey School	\$5,000
Madera	Yosemite Joint Union HS	Yosemite High School	\$5,000
Merced	Merced USD	Livingston High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim Union HSD	Gilbert High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Katella High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Oxford High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Anaheim High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Ball Junior High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Cypress High School	\$5,000

**Safe School Plan Implementation Grantees  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Orange	Anaheim USD	Dale Junior High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	John F. Kennedy High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Loara High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Orangeview Junior High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Polaris	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Savanna High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	South Junior High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Sycamore Junior High School	\$5,000
Orange	Anaheim USD	Walker Junior High School	\$5,000
Orange	Fullerton Joint Union HSD	Buena Park High School	\$5,000
Orange	Irvine USD	Rancho San Joaquin Middle	\$5,000
Riverside	Alvord USD	Promenade School	\$5,000
Sacramento	San Juan USD	Arden Middle School	\$5,000
San Bernardino	Apple Valley USD	Apple Valley Middle School	\$5,000
San Bernardino	Redlands USD	Redlands High School	\$5,000
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City USD	Pacific High School	\$5,000
San Diego	Cardiff SD	Ada Harris Elementary School	\$5,000
San Diego	Cardiff SD	Cardiff Elementary School	\$5,000
San Diego	Oceanside USD	Ivey Ranch Elementary	\$5,000
San Diego	Oceanside USD	Lincoln Middle School	\$5,000
San Diego	Oceanside USD	Martin Luther King Middle	\$5,000
San Diego	Poway USD	Black Mountain Middle School	\$5,000
San Diego	Poway USD	Meadowbrook Middle School	\$5,000
San Diego	San Diego USD	Lewis Middle School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater USD	Chula Vista Middle	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater USD	Eastlake High School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater USD	Hilltop Middle School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater USD	Mar Vista Middle School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater USD	Montgomery High School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater USD	Montgomery Middle School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater USD	Rancho del Rey Middle School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater USD	Southwest High School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater Union HSD	Bonita Vista High School	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater Union HSD	Chula Vista High	\$5,000
San Diego	Sweetwater Union HSD	Hilltop High School	\$5,000
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	International Studies Academy	\$5,000



**Safe School Plan Implementation Grantees  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Amount</b>
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	Benjamin Franklin Middle	\$5,000
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	E.R. Taylor Elementary School	\$5,000
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	Visitacion Valley Middle	\$5,000
Santa Barbara	Lompoc USD	Cabrillo High School	\$5,000
Santa Barbara	Lompoc USD	Maple High School	\$5,000
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara HSD	Dos Pueblos High School	\$5,000
Santa Clara	Cupertino Union SD	Nimitz Elementary	\$5,000
Santa Clara	Moreland SD	Samuel Curtis Rogers Middle	\$5,000
Santa Clara	Santa Clara USD	Montague	\$5,000
Santa Clara	Union Elementary USD	Union Middle School	\$5,000
Stanislaus	Chatom Union SD	Chatom School	\$5,000
Tulare	Visalia USD	La Joya Middle School	\$5,000
		<b>Total</b>	<b>\$415,000</b>



## CALIFORNIA SAFE SCHOOLS ASSESSMENT

**Program Description and Goals:** California's school crime reporting program, the California Safe Schools Assessment (CSSA), began on July 1, 1995. The program provides information to policy makers in schools, districts, county offices of education, and state government that will provide them an awareness of the most pressing school crime and safety issues; implement programs and strategies to address those issues; and evaluate the effectiveness of those programs and strategies. All K-12 public schools are required to report incidents to the California Department of Education that meet the criteria of a reportable crime. The Department developed the criteria for reportable incidents with input from a statewide advisory committee. Crimes are reported in four crime categories: Crimes Against Persons, Drug and Alcohol Offenses, Property Crimes, and Other Crimes. The Department submits an annual report to the Legislature providing a statewide summary of the data reported by the local school districts and county offices of education and identifying school crime trends.

**Statutory Authority:** *Penal Code* sections 628 et seq.

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** Annual General Fund appropriation in the Budget Act of \$1,233,000.

**Population Served:** All California K-12 public schools are required to participate in this data collection process.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** The Department uses a three-part validation system to determine the accuracy and reliability of the data submitted by the local school districts and county offices of education. The three procedures used are as follows:

- All CSSA forms are reviewed to ensure completeness and internal consistency.
- A validation crosscheck is conducted between certain CSSA data and the number of student suspensions for similar types of incidents submitted by all school districts and county offices of education.
- Validation site visits are conducted at selected reporting local education agencies to review their CSSA data collection and reporting system and provide technical assistance to improve data accuracy and consistency.

**Contact Persons:** Jean L. Scott, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 323-5074;  
e-mail: jescott@cde.ca.gov

Jerry Hardenburg, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 323-1025;  
e-mail: jhardenb@cde.ca.gov



## CALIFORNIA HEALTHY KIDS SURVEY

**Program Description and Goals:** The California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) is a comprehensive youth health and risk behavior data collection support system for school districts to use in promoting safe and drug-free schools and healthy, resilient youth. It provides a mechanism for school districts to respond to a federal priority for recipients of funding received under Title IV, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, Improving America's Schools Act, to use *principles of effectiveness* in designing and implementing prevention and intervention programs. The *principles of effectiveness* include conducting needs assessments, setting measurable goals and objectives, implementing effective research-based programs, and evaluating programs. School districts that volunteer to participate in the CHKS are required to survey students in grades 7, 9, and 11, and are encouraged to survey students in grade 5.

CHKS is a flexible, full-service survey support system and can be used at both the state and local level to assess:

- use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs;
- violence, school safety, gang involvement, and delinquency;
- nutrition and physical activity;
- sexual behavior;
- exposure to prevention and intervention; and
- risk and protective (resiliency) factors

This highly-confidential survey consists of seven subject area modules that include survey questions drawn primarily from the national Youth Risk Behavior Survey and the California Student Substance Use Survey (CSS). The modules can be customized to meet specific local needs. The outcome-oriented data collected through this survey can be used to establish and assess Title IV program performance indicators. Over 600 local educational agencies (60 percent of total districts and county offices of education) have administered the survey through the 1999-2000 school year, and the local data collected from this statewide survey provide a representative sampling (87 percent) of all the students enrolled statewide in grades 7, 9, and 11. The survey data provide for local, state, and national comparisons.

**Statutory Authority:** Under provisions of the Health and Safety Code section 11605, the California Attorney General's Office conducts a biennial survey of drug and alcohol use in a statewide sample of students in grades 7, 9, and 11. The Attorney General's Office is using the CSS to meet this requirement. Beginning in the fall of 1999, in collaboration with CDE, the core local CHKS questions have been integrated into the statewide CSS. The Attorney General's Office uses this survey to better target its prevention efforts.

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** Funding available to administer CHKS varies annually and is solely dependent on other available federal and state funding sources.

**Population Served:** Although a minimum of three grades take the CHKS, these grades are the pivotal transition periods for risky behaviors to emerge, and all K-12 students can benefit from prevention and intervention activities that school districts implement based on CHKS data.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** Efforts to improve the administration of the survey and use of the data are ongoing. CHKS provides detailed, user-friendly reports and support materials for statewide and local use. Project advisors are available to help users of the survey interpret the data and use the results to improve health education and prevention programs.

**Contact Person:** Myra Young, School Health Education Consultant, (916) 657-3369;  
e-mail: [myoung@cde.ca.gov](mailto:myoung@cde.ca.gov)

## AFTER SCHOOL LEARNING AND SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

**Program Description and Goals:** The After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program funds the establishment of local after school enrichment programs. Local programs partner schools with communities to provide academic and literacy support and safe, constructive alternatives for students in the kindergarten through ninth grades.

Applicants may include (1) local educational agencies (LEAs); or (2) cities, counties, or nonprofit organizations in partnership with an LEA or LEAs. The school district and the principal of each school site must approve the application to ensure full integration with the academic program of the schools.

Program planning consists of a collaborative process that involves parents, youth, and representatives of participating school sites, governmental agencies, such as city and county parks and recreation departments, community organizations, and the private sector. Community organizations which could be collaborative partners in the initiative include: law enforcement agencies, local colleges and universities, businesses, foundations, parent-teacher associations, service organizations, the faith community, museums, youth-serving groups and the social, health, and mental health services.

Elementary school programs must operate for a minimum of three hours per day and until at least 6 p.m. on every regular school day. Middle school programs may choose a flexible schedule of 9 hours within three days per week to accomplish program goals. Programs must operate on school sites or adjacent to school sites. All staff, who directly supervise pupils, will meet the minimum qualifications for an instructional aide in that school district, and school site principals will approve site supervisors. Programs will maintain a pupil-to-staff member ratio of 20 to 1.

**Statutory Authority:** *Education Code* sections 8481 through 8484.5 (SB 1756/AB 1428/AB 2284)

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** \$87.8 million from the General Fund is provided to school and community partnerships to deliver local after-school education and enrichment programs. The three-year grants require annual renewal that is contingent on fiscal and program information provided by the grantees. The grantee or its partners must provide a 50 percent local match (cash or in-kind) from participating school district, governmental agencies, community organizations, or the private sector. Grants are calculated on the basis of an allocation of \$5 per day per pupil, with the maximum grant for one school year totaling \$75,000 for elementary schools and \$100,000 for middle schools or junior high schools. Elementary schools (with enrollments over 600 students) and middle schools (with enrollments over 900 students) are eligible for a supplemental grant to operate the program during any combination of the summer, intersession, or vacation periods. Applicants receive priority in funding if they include elementary, middle, and junior high schools in which a minimum of 50 percent of the pupils are eligible for free or reduced-price meals.

**Population Served:** These programs provide educational support and safe, constructive alternatives for students in kindergarten through grade nine.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** After-school programs participating in the After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships Program will submit annual outcome-based data from evaluations that they conduct locally. This data must include measures for academic performance, attendance, and positive behavioral changes. The first annual evaluation report is due in August 2000. The California Department of Education (CDE) may consider the results of these evaluations when determining eligibility for annual grant renewal.

**Contact Person:** Pat Rainey, Education Administrator I, (916) 657-3558;  
e-mail: [prainey@cde.ca.gov](mailto:prainey@cde.ca.gov)



**After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships**  
**1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	Alameda USD	\$175,000
Alameda	Berkeley USD	\$186,000
Alameda	Berkeley USD	\$225,000
Alameda	Berkeley USD	\$300,000
Alameda	City Of Livermore	\$198,000
Alameda	Hayward USD	\$528,500
Alameda	Hayward USD	\$541,925
Alameda	Newark USD	\$89,325
Alameda	Newark USD	\$202,800
Alameda	Oakland USD	\$75,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	\$93,590
Alameda	Oakland USD	\$204,700
Alameda	San Leandro USD	\$180,000
Contra Costa	Mt. Diablo USD	\$748,053
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa USD	\$387,000
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa USD	\$565,650
Del Norte	Del Norte County USD	\$237,900
Fresno	Fresno COE	\$2,133,898
Fresno	Fresno COE	\$2,513,745
Humboldt	Rio Dell ESD	\$36,000
Imperial	Calexico USD	\$99,000
Imperial	Calexico USD	\$112,000
Kern	Arvin Union SD	\$292,500
Kern	Bakersfield City SD	\$283,000
Kern	Greenfield USD	\$1,014,538
Kern	Kernville Union SD	\$260,700
Kern	Lamont Elementary SD	\$231,600
Kern	Lamont SD	\$130,000
Kings	Hanford Elementary SD	\$75,000
Kings	Reef-Sunset USD	\$236,250
Los Angeles	Baldwin Park USD	\$360,000
Los Angeles	Bellflower USD	\$896,050
Los Angeles	Burbank USD	\$240,000
Los Angeles	City of Pico Rivera	\$432,000
Los Angeles	City of Pico Rivera	\$551,200
Los Angeles	Compton USD	\$943,670

**After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships**  
**1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Los Angeles	Culver City USD	\$92,400
Los Angeles	Downey USD	\$426,350
Los Angeles	Glendale USD	\$526,125
Los Angeles	Hacienda La Puente USD	\$594,000
Los Angeles	Lancaster SD	\$1,026,450
Los Angeles	LA's Best Afterschool	\$1,145,228
Los Angeles	LAUSD/E, Central, S-E	\$2,524,910
Los Angeles	LAUSD/Sch. Reform Office	\$141,375
Los Angeles	LAUSD-W/S Cluster	\$1,674,770
Los Angeles	Lawndale ESD	\$382,500
Los Angeles	Lennox SD	\$187,200
Los Angeles	Long Beach USD	\$130,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	\$102,492
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	\$770,650
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	\$1,503,642
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	\$1,524,935
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	\$3,585,447
Los Angeles	Monrovia USD	\$468,000
Los Angeles	Pasadena USD	\$560,200
Los Angeles	Pasadena USD	\$888,745
Los Angeles	Rowland USD	\$130,000
Los Angeles	Rowland USD	\$130,000
Madera	Madera COE	\$582,675
Marin	San Rafael City SD	\$315,500
Mariposa	Mariposa County USD	\$90,000
Modoc	Tulelake Basin JUSD	\$319,000
Mono	Mono COE	\$42,000
Monterey	Greenfield Union SD	\$430,203
Monterey	King City Union ESD	\$130,000
Monterey	Monterey Peninsula USD	\$250,000
Monterey	San Lucas USD	\$74,880
Monterey	Santa Rita Union SD	\$868,965
Monterey	Soledad USD	\$249,300
Orange	Anaheim City SD	\$1,908,179
Orange	Capistrano USD	\$62,500
Orange	Capistrano USD	\$76,050
Orange	Fullerton SD	\$251,400

**After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships**  
**1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Orange	Newport-Mesa USD	\$391,000
Orange	Santa Ana USD	\$338,000
Orange	Santa Ana USD	\$368,550
Orange	Santa Ana USD	\$1,836,225
Placer	Western Placer USD	\$75,600
Placer	Western Placer USD	\$126,000
Riverside	Corona-Norco USD	\$360,360
Riverside	Jurupa USD	\$143,700
Riverside	Lake Elsinore USD	\$52,000
Riverside	Lake Elsinore USD	\$124,000
Riverside	Riverside USD	\$1,122,825
Sacramento	City of Sacramento - Start	\$1,065,450
Sacramento	City of Sacramento - Start	\$1,661,450
Sacramento	Elk Grove USD	\$144,593
Sacramento	Elk Grove USD	\$352,885
Sacramento	Folsom Cordova USD	\$199,100
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	\$859,675
Sacramento	San Juan USD	\$223,200
Sacramento	San Juan USD	\$334,800
San Benito	Aromas/San Juan USD	\$95,000
San Bernardino	Apple Valley USD	\$117,000
San Bernardino	Baker Valley USD	\$70,200
San Bernardino	Chino Valley USD	\$490,568
San Bernardino	Hesperia USD	\$558,000
San Bernardino	Morongo USD	\$36,000
San Bernardino	Morongo USD	\$58,500
San Bernardino	Ontario-Montclair	\$73,800
San Bernardino	Ontario-Montclair SD	\$590,590
San Bernardino	Oro Grande SD	\$93,500
San Bernardino	Redlands USD	\$75,000
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City USD	\$1,341,085
San Bernardino	San Bernardino USD	\$238,628
San Diego	Ramona USD	\$146,575
San Diego	San Diego COE	\$5,754,188
San Diego	San Diego COE	\$9,099,411
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	\$390,000
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	\$416,226

**After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships**  
**1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	\$1,066,605
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	\$1,337,815
San Joaquin	City of Lodi	\$117,000
San Joaquin	City of Stockton	\$181,500
San Joaquin	Lincoln USD	\$619,300
San Luis Obispo	San Miguel Joint Union	\$70,230
San Mateo	City Of Redwood City	\$254,700
San Mateo	Ravenswood City SD	\$550,350
Santa Barbara	Carpinteria USD	\$97,110
Santa Barbara	Carpinteria USD	\$100,000
Santa Barbara	Carpinteria USD	\$117,000
Santa Barbara	Los Alamos SD	\$74,700
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara ESD	\$477,875
Santa Clara	City of San Jose	\$400,300
Santa Clara	City of San Jose	\$1,437,900
Santa Clara	Franklin-Mc Kinley SD	\$1,378,350
Santa Clara	Luther Burbank SD	\$97,403
Santa Clara	Mountain View SD	\$97,500
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale SD	\$248,500
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley USD	\$478,000
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley USD	\$631,200
Shasta	Enterprise Elementary	\$247,500
Shasta	Enterprise ESD	\$228,250
Shasta	Redding SD	\$359,525
Solano	City of Vacaville	\$72,000
Solano	City of Vacaville	\$72,000
Solano	Fairfield-Suisun USD	\$558,000
Solano	Vallejo City USD	\$338,000
Sonoma	Bellevue Elementary SD	\$275,625
Sonoma	Santa Rosa City Schools	\$298,800
Stanislaus	Newman-Crows Landing USD	\$36,000
Sutter	Yuba City USD	\$130,000
Tehama	Corning Union Elem	\$259,200
Tehama	Tehama COE	\$1,031,300
Tulare	Exeter Public Schools	\$130,000
Tulare	Lindsay USD	\$224,100
Tulare	Porterville USD	\$260,000

**After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships**  
**1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Tulare	Porterville USD	\$957,645
Tulare	Tulare COE	\$608,595
Ventura	Hueneme SD	\$157,500
Ventura	Oxnard SD	\$104,250
Ventura	Santa Paula ESD	\$453,600
Yolo	Esparto USD	\$158,400
Yolo	Washington USD	\$130,000
Yolo	Woodland JUSD	\$45,000
Yuba	Marysville JUSD	\$243,900
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$86,581,877</b>

**After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnerships**  
**1999-2000**

**Regional Grants**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Education Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	Berkeley Unified	\$120,522
Butte	Butte	\$60,000
Inyo	Inyo	\$79,756
Los Angeles	Los Angeles County	\$235,957
Mendocino	Mendocino County	\$60,000
Monterey	Monterey County	\$73,092
Sacramento	Folsom Cordova Unified	\$70,947
San Diego	San Diego	\$189,921
Stanislaus	Stanislaus County	\$60,000
Tulare	Tulare County	\$89,805
Ventura	Ventura County	\$60,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,100,000</b>

## CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND YOUTH MEDIATION

**Program Description and Goals:** The Conflict Resolution/Youth Mediation (CR/YM) Grant Program, first funded in 1995-1996, provides specialized training to teams of K-12 school staff in conflict resolution strategies to reduce conflict and violent incidents on school campuses. The purpose of the Conflict Resolution and Youth Mediation Grant program is to initiate comprehensive programs for California public K-12 schools. School-based conflict resolution programs teach students to resolve their disputes without resorting to violence. School safety research finds that the most effective school safety programs are comprehensive in scope and preventive in focus.

The goal of the program is to provide training opportunities to schools that assist them in implementing a comprehensive CR/YM program that uses the following three approaches:

- *peer mediation*—training a group of students to conduct peer mediations.
- *education*—teach students conflict resolution principles in separate courses or integrate the concepts into the curriculum.
- *school community*—train parents, teachers, students, and staff in the principles of conflict resolution to create a peaceable school.

For training to be effective, it must complement a school's strategy to serve all students, including those who are typically excluded from formal student leadership activities. The training should also complement a school's plan to involve family and community members to reinforce the skills and practices students use to resolve conflict in a peaceful manner.

The Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office evaluates proposals for CR/YM programs, awards grants to promising programs, provides technical assistance to those programs, and evaluates the effectiveness of the program.

**Statutory Authority:** Budget Act language

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** The Budget Act provides \$280,000 annually in ongoing local assistance appropriation for the Conflict Resolution/Youth Mediation Program.

**Population Served:** The Conflict Resolution and Youth Mediation Program primarily serves K-12 students, teachers, and staff. During the 1999-2000 school year, more than 25,000 students received direct services as a result of the program.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** In prior years, an independent evaluation of the Conflict Resolution/Youth Mediation Program demonstrated the effectiveness of the program resulting in students, teachers, staff and law enforcement trained in conflict resolution strategies which improved school climate.

**Contact Person:** Bonnie Williamson, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 324-6159;  
e-mail: bwilliam@cde.ca.gov

**Conflict Resolution/Youth Mediation**  
**1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Contra Costa	Brentwood Union ESD Elementary SD	Bristow Middle	\$10,000
Fresno	Fresno USD	Edison Computech Middle School	\$10,000
Fresno	Fresno USD	Slater Elementary School	\$10,000
Fresno	Kings Canyon USD	Reedley High	\$10,000
Humboldt	Southern Humboldt USD	Miranda Junior High	\$10,000
Imperial	Brawley Union High School	Brawley Union High School	\$10,000
Kern	Kernville Union SD	Kernville Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Kernville Union SD	Woodrow Wallace Middle School	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Burbank USD	Jordan Middle School	\$10,000
Los Angeles	El Rancho USD	Meller Elementary	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Glendale USD	Jefferson Elementary	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Lancaster SD	Piute Middle School	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	John Muir Middle School	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Rosemead SD	Emma W. Shuey School	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Walnut Valley USD	Suzanne Middle School	\$10,000
Los Angeles	William S. Hart Union HSD	La Mesa Jr. High School	\$10,000
Merced	Merced COE	Valley Community School	\$10,000
Orange	Anaheim Union HSD	Anaheim High School	\$10,000
Orange	Anaheim Union HSD	Gilbert High School	\$10,000
Orange	Anaheim Union HSD	Sycamore Junior High School	\$10,000
Orange	Anaheim Union HSD	Walker Junior High School	\$10,000
Orange	Irvine USD	Bonita Canyon	\$10,000
Sacramento	Rio Linda Union SD	Woodridge Elementary	\$10,000
San Diego	Vista USD	Beaumont Elementary	\$10,000
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	Benjamin Franklin	\$10,000
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	Everett Middle School	\$10,000
San Luis Obispo	Lucia Mar USD	Judkins Middle School	\$10,000
San Mateo	Millbrae Elementary SD	Taylor Middle School	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Lompoc USD	Maple High School	\$10,000
Solano	Vallejo City USD	Beverly Hills	\$10,000
Solano	Vallejo City USD	Loma Vista Elementary	\$10,000
Solano	Vallejo City USD	Mare Island Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Cotati/Rohnert Park USD	Thomas Page School	\$10,000
Sonoma	Sonoma COE	Alternative Education Programs	\$10,000
Ventura	Ventura USD	E.P. Foster Elementary School	\$10,000
Yolo	Woodland Joint USD	Beamer Park Elementary	\$10,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$360,000</b>



## **GANG RISK INTERVENTION PROGRAM**

**Program Description and Goals:** The Gang Risk Intervention Program (GRIP) was first funded by the state as a pilot project in Los Angeles County. An independent contractor evaluated the program and found it to be effective in reducing gang violence, so the State Legislature funded additional programs throughout the state beginning in 1995-96. The participating counties are:

Alameda (\$196,500)	Orange (\$100,000)	Santa Barbara (\$100,000)
Glenn (\$100,000)	Riverside (\$100,000)	Santa Cruz (\$123,000)
Humboldt (\$140,000)	San Bernardino (\$110,000)	Sonoma (\$232,500)
Kern (\$100,000)	San Diego (\$200,000)	Stanislaus (\$100,000)
Los Angeles (\$1,075,000)	San Francisco (\$200,000)	Sutter (\$123,000)

The Legislature's stated goals for GRIP are to establish community-based programs to reduce involvement in gang activities and establish ties between youth and the community. GRIP programs provide a "full-time, paid community-based coordinator, familiar with local gang structures." Program activities, which vary widely according to local needs, include counseling, academic mentoring, conflict resolution training, sports and cultural activities, job training and information, positive interaction with law enforcement, and teacher training.

The Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office evaluates proposals for GRIP programs, awards grants to promising programs, and provides technical assistance, particularly in the area of program evaluation and identification of promising practices.

**Statutory Authority:** *Education Code* sections 58730 et seq.

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** The Budget Act local assistance appropriation for GRIP is \$3 million per year, which supports programs in 15 counties (\$1 million of the funding goes to Los Angeles County). There is an additional \$150,000 appropriated from the General Fund for state administration of the project. The funding is ongoing.

**Population Served:** The directly-served clientele of the GRIP program are K-12 students and their families. Some program activities are aimed specifically at "high-risk" students, while others are designed for the entire population of students in a school. Approximately 9,000 GRIP students are served in a school year, along with approximately 3,000 parents of GRIP students.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** An independent evaluation of the pilot GRIP program in Los Angeles demonstrated reduced violence levels, reduced truancy, and reduced suspensions and expulsions. Currently-funded GRIP programs perform annual self-evaluations. Those evaluations identify successes in the areas of reduced drop-outs, truancy, alcohol/drug use, fighting, and suspensions. The self-evaluations also provide information regarding program operational difficulties, and program successes which can be shared with other programs.

**Contact Person:** Chuck Nichols, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 323-1026;  
e-mail: cnichols@cde.ca.gov



## HEALTHY START SUPPORT SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

**Program Description and Goals:** The Healthy Start Support Services for Children Act was established by the Legislature in 1991. The goals of Healthy Start include: ensuring that each child receives the support that he or she needs to learn well; building the capacity of students and parents to be leaders and decision-makers in their communities; and helping schools and other agencies to provide more effective support to children and their families. Grantees work to measurably improve the lives of children and their families by providing culturally-appropriate, integrated, accessible, strengths-based education, health, mental health, social, and other supports and services, located at or near schools. California's Healthy Start improves the lives of children and families by redesigning service systems to be accountable, family focused, accessible, comprehensive, preventive, locally controlled, and reform centered. Key components of successful local Healthy Start implementation include culturally appropriate systems, case-managed service delivery, parental involvement, and informal supports in addition to agency services. Healthy Start emphasizes improved school performance because the ability to learn well is important to life success. Evaluation is a key component of local Healthy Start initiatives. Agencies and institutions with current responsibilities for achieving these results play a major role in local Healthy Start initiatives.

**Statutory Authority:** *Education Code* sections 8800 through 8807

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** \$39 million from the General Fund is provided annually to local educational agencies (LEAs) and their collaborative partners by awarding one-to-two year collaborative planning grants (\$50,000) and three-to-five year operational grants (total maximum of \$400,000). All Healthy Start grantees must match the state funds they receive by at least 25 percent in cash, services, or resources. Additional "matching funds" are encouraged. Healthy Start grant funds must supplement, not supplant, existing services. Sustainability of community, school district, and county supports and services beyond the grant period is an expectation of operational grantees.

**Population Served:** Elementary, middle, and secondary schools are eligible; feeder preschools may be part of an application that includes their partner elementary schools. School districts or county offices of education or charter schools that have not elected the block grant funding model and their collaborative partners may apply on behalf of a single school or a group of schools. Ninety percent of schools must meet specific eligibility criteria for needy students or families, or limited English proficiency, and 10 percent must demonstrate special factors that warrant consideration.

Approximately one million students are served through 1,500 schools with Healthy Start planning (199) and operational (547) sites.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** During the first three years of the Healthy Start initiative, grantees participated in a statewide evaluation conducted by SRI, International. The 1996 evaluation results demonstrated that (1) Healthy Start reached those it is intended to benefit and provided a large number and variety of services; (2) student behavior, performance, and school climate improved; (3) families' unmet needs for basic goods and services were cut in half; and (4) Healthy Start improved how children and families were being serviced. Lessons learned from grantees participating in that evaluation were used to design the current evaluation process. A more recent evaluation, based on data collected in 1997, indicated the further findings that:

(1) academic results for students most in need increased appreciably; (2) students' health issues, especially preventive care, are being addressed more often; (3) substantial improvements in basic needs are demonstrated (housing, food, clothing, transportation, finances, and employment); (4) student drug use decreased and self-esteem increased; and (5) family violence decreased. Healthy Start grantees serve students and their families across rural and urban communities in all geographic areas of the state and across all ethnic groups and ages including preschool children and adults.

**Contact Person:** Pat Rainey, Education Administrator I, (916) 657-3558;  
e-mail: [prainey@cde.ca.gov](mailto:prainey@cde.ca.gov)

**Healthy Start Support Services for Children  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District or County Office</b>	<b>School(s)</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	Alameda USD	Miller Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Alameda	Berkeley USD	Malcolm X Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Alameda	Berkeley USD	Longfellow Arts and Technology Middle, 6-8	\$400,000
Alameda	Berkeley USD	Washington Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Alameda	Berkeley USD	Cragmonth Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Alameda	Castro Valley USD	Canyon Middle, 6-8	\$400,000
Alameda	Castro Valley USD	Creekside Middle, 6-8	\$400,000
Alameda	Newark USD	Graham Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Alameda	Newark USD	Musick Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Alameda	Newark USD	Newark Junior High, 7-8	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Peralta Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Fruitvale, K-5	\$400,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Castlemont High, 9-12	\$400,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Sequoia, K-5	\$400,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Sobrante Park, K-5	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Longfellow, K-5	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	McClymonds High, 9-12	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Frick Middle, 6-8	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Ralph Bunch Alternative, K-12	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Laurel Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Hoover, K-5	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Westlake Middle, 6-8	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Cole, 4-8	\$50,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	Martin Luther King, Jr, K-3	\$50,000
Alameda	San Lorenzo USD	Royal Sunset High, 7-12	\$400,000
Butte	Chico USD	Chico Junior High, 7-8	\$50,000
Butte	Oroville City Elementary	Oakdale Heights Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Colusa	Colusa County	Williams Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
		Williams Jr/Sr, 7-12	
		Maxwell Elementary, K-8	
		Maxwell High, 9-12	
		Arbuckle Elementary, K-6	
		Grand Island Elementary, K-6	
		Lloyd Johnson Jr. High., 7-8	
		Pierce High, 9-12	
		James Burchfield Primary, K-3	
		Egling Middle, 4-6	
		Colusa High, 9-12	

**Healthy Start Support Services for Children  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District or County Office</b>	<b>School(s)</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa USD	Lake Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa USD	Chavez Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Del Norte	Del Norte County USD	Bess Maxwell, K-5 Joe Hamilton, K-5	\$400,000
El Dorado	El Dorado Union High	El Dorado High, 9-12	\$400,000
Fresno	Clovis USD	Sierra Vista, K-6 Tarpey, K-6	\$50,000
Fresno	Fresno USD	Wawona Middle, 7-8	\$50,000
Fresno	Fresno USD	Dailey Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Fresno	Kerman USD	Kerman-Floyd Elementary, K-6 Sun Empire Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Fresno	Parlier USD	Parlier Junior High, 7-8	\$50,000
Fresno	Sanger USD	Del Rey, K-6	\$400,000
Fresno	Selma USD	Roosevelt Elementary, K-6	\$380,677
Fresno	Westside Elementary	Westside Elementary, K-8	\$50,000
Humboldt	Blue Lake USD	Blue Lake Elementary, K-8	\$50,000
Inyo	Owens Valley USD	Keith Bright, 7-12	\$400,000
Kern	Arvin Union	Sierra Vista Elementary, K-2 Bear Mountain Elementary, 3-5 Haven Drive Middle, 6-8	\$400,000
Kern	Buttonwillow Union Elementary	Buttonwillow, K-8	\$392,926
Kern	South Fork Union	South Fork, K-8	\$381,901
Kern	Standard Elementary	Standard Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Kern	Tehachapi USD	Wells Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Lake	Lake County	Kelseyville Primary, K-3 Gard Street, 4-5	\$400,000
Lake	Lake County	Burns Valley, K-5	\$400,000
Lake	Lake County	Lakeport Elementary, K-3 Terrace School, 4-8	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Alhambra City Elementary	Emery Park, K-8	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Azusa USD	Azusa High, 9-12 Center Middle, 6-8 Foothill Middle, 6-8	\$49,415
Los Angeles	Compton USD	General Rosecrans Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Compton USD	King Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Downey USD	Lynn L. Pace Elementary, 1-3 Ward Elementary, 1-3	\$50,000

**Healthy Start Support Services for Children  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District or County Office</b>	<b>School(s)</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Los Angeles	Long Beach USD	Franklin Middle, 6-8 Stevenson Elementary, K-5 Whittier Elementary, K-5 Lincoln Elementary, K-5 International Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Long Beach USD	Robert E. Lee Elementary, K-3 Frances E. Willard Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Queen Anne Place Elementary, PreK-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Fairfax High, 9-12 Bancroft Middle, 6-8 Burroughs Middle, 6-8 Melrose Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Menlo Avenue, K-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Normandie Avenue, PreK-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Abraham Lincoln High, 9-12 Gates Street Elementary, PreK-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	99th Street Elementary, PreK-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Narbonne High, 9-12	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Hazeltine Elementary, K-5 Sylvan Park Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Patrick Henry Middle, 6-8 Tulsa Elementary, K-5 Darby Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	R.L. Stevenson Middle, 6-8 Rowan Avenue Elementary, K-5 Lorena Street Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Fleming Middle, 6-8	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Whitman High, 9-12	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Parmelee Avenue Elementary, PreK-5	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Washington Prep High, 9-12 Duke Ellington High, 9-12	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	75th St, PreK-6	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Youth Opportunity, 9-12	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Dorsey High, 9-12	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Francisco Bravo Medical Magnet High	\$50,000
Los Angeles	Norwalk-La Mirada USD	Hargitt Middle, 6-8 Moffitt Elementary, K-5 Sanchez Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Los Angeles	Pasadena USD	Edison Elementary, PreK-6	\$50,000

**Healthy Start Support Services for Children  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District or County Office</b>	<b>School(s)</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Los Angeles	Rowland USD	Farjardo Elementary, K-6 Jellick Elementary, K-6 Rowland Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Los Angeles	San Gabriel USD	Gabrielino High, 9-12 Jefferson Middle, 6-8 Community Education Center, 9-12	\$400,000
Los Angeles	San Gabriel USD	McKinley Elementary, Pre K-5 Washington Elementary, K-5 Roosevelt Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Madera	Yosemite Joint Union	Yosemite High, 9-12 Ahwahnee High, 9-12 Evergreen High, 9-12 Foothill High, 9-12 Mountain View, 9-12 Raymond Granite High, 9-12	\$42,477
Merced	Delhi USD	Schendel Elementary, K-6 El Capitan Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Merced	Winton Elementary	Sparks Elementary, K-5 Crookham Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Modoc	Tulelake Basin Joint USD	Tulelake High, 7-12 Tulelake Continuation High, 9-12	\$49,353
Monterey	Alisal Union	Creekside Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Monterey	King City Joint Union High	Greenfield High, 9-12	\$50,000
Monterey	Monterey Peninsula USD	Monterey High, 9-12	\$50,000
Monterey	North Monterey County USD	Gambetta Middle, 6-8 Moss Landing Middle, 6-8	\$50,000
Monterey	San Ardo Union Elementary	San Ardo Elementary, K-8	\$400,000
Monterey	Santa Rita Union	Santa Rita Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Monterey	Soledad USD	San Vicente Elementary	\$50,000
Napa	Calistoga Joint USD	Calistoga Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Orange	Fullerton Elementary	Nicolas Junior High, 7-8	\$50,000
Orange	Magnolia Elementary	Esther Walter, K-6 Robert Pyles, K-6 Mattie L. Maxwell, K-6 Albert Schweitzer, K-6	\$400,000
Orange	Tustin USD	Helen Estock Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Orange	Tustin USD	Majorie Veeh Elementary	\$50,000
Placer	Roseville City Elementary	Cirby Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Riverside	Banning USD	Cabazon Elementary, K-5 Central Elementary, K-5 Nicolet Middle, 6-8	\$50,000



**Healthy Start Support Services for Children  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District or County Office</b>	<b>School(s)</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Riverside	Coachella Valley USD	Sea View Elementary, K-8 Oasis Elementary, K-8 West Shores High, 9-12	\$400,000
Riverside	Nuview Union	Nuview Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Sacramento	Center USD	Cyril Spinelli Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Sacramento	Folsom Cordova USD	Cordova High, 9-12	\$50,000
Sacramento	Grant Joint Union	Martin Luther King Jr, 7-8	\$50,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	<b>A.M. Winn Elementary, K-6</b> <b>Abraham Lincoln Elementary, K-6</b>	\$400,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	William Land Elementary, K-6 Washington Elementary, K-4	\$400,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	Ethel Phillips, PreK-6 Fruitridge, PreK-5	\$400,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	Tahoe Elementary, K-6 Marian Anderson Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	John Bidwell Magnet, K-6	\$25,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	Mark Hopkins Elementary, K-6 Cm Goethe Middle, 7-8	\$50,000
Sacramento	San Juan USD	Kenneth Avenue, K-6	\$400,000
San Benito	Hollister Elementary	Marguerite Maze Middle, 6-8	\$50,000
San Bernardino	Barstow USD	Crestline Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
San Bernardino	Ontario-Montclair	Lincoln, PreK-3 Central Elementary, K-6 Vina Danks Middle, 6-8	\$50,000
San Bernardino	Upland USD	Upland Junior High, 7-8	\$400,000
San Diego	Cajon Valley Union	Bostonia Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
San Diego	Chula Vista Elementary	Otay Elementary, K-5 Montgomery, K-6	\$400,000
San Diego	Chula Vista Elementary	Silver Wing Elementary, K-6 Montgomery Middle, 7-8	\$50,000
San Diego	Julian Union	Julian Elementary, PreK-6 Julian Jr. High, 7-8 Julian High, 9-12	\$400,000
San Diego	La Mesa-Spring Valley	La Mesa Dale Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
San Diego	San Diego City USD	Bayview Terrace Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
San Diego	San Diego City USD	Ocean Beach Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
San Diego	San Diego City USD	Kit Carson Elementary, K-5	\$50,000

**Healthy Start Support Services for Children  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District or County Office</b>	<b>School(s)</b>	<b>Amount</b>
San Diego	San Ysidro Elementary	Beyer Elementary, K-5 Willow Elementary, K-5 Smythe Elementary, K-5 La Mirada Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	International Studies Academy, 9-12	\$50,000
San Francisco	San Francisco USD	Leonard R. Flynn, K-5	\$50,000
San Joaquin	Stockton USD	Grant Elementary, K-3	\$50,000
San Luis Obispo	Lucia Mar USD	Arroyo Grande High, 9-12	\$400,000
San Mateo	Cabrillo USD	Half Moon Bay, 9-12	\$400,000
San Mateo	Cabrillo USD	Cunha Middle, 6-8	\$50,000
San Mateo	Jefferson Elementary	George Washington Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
San Mateo	La Honda-Pescadero USD	Pescadero Elementary, K-8	\$400,000
San Mateo	La Honda-Pescadero USD	Pescadero High, 9-12	\$400,000
San Mateo	Redwood City Elementary	Roosevelt Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
San Mateo	Redwood City Elementary	Kennedy Middle, 6-8	\$50,000
San Mateo	Redwood City Elementary	John Gill, K-5	\$50,000
San Mateo	Redwood City Elementary	Hawes Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Santa Barbara	Carpinteria USD	Aliso Elementary, 3-5	\$50,000
Santa Barbara	Los Alamos Elementary	Olga Reed Elementary, K-8	\$400,000
Santa Barbara	Santa Ynez Valley Union	Santa Ynez Valley Union High, 9-12	\$50,000
Santa Clara	East Side Union High	W.C. Overfelt High, 9-12 Apollo High, 9-12 Dorsa, K-5 Hubbard, K-5	\$400,000
Santa Clara	Mountain View Elementary	Mariano Castro Elementary, K-5	\$400,000
Santa Clara	Mountain View Elementary	Graham Middle, 6-8	\$399,994
Santa Clara	Mt. Pleasant Elementary	Foothill Intermediate, 4-6	\$400,000
Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz City	Branciforte Elementary, K-6	\$397,345
Shasta	Enterprise Elementary	Parsons Middle, 6-8	\$400,000
Shasta	Indian Springs Elementary	Indian Springs Elementary, K-8	\$400,000
Shasta	Redding Elementary	Juniper Academy, K-8	\$50,000
Siskiyou	Yreka Union High	Yreka High, 9-12 Discovery High, 9-12	\$50,000
Sonoma	Healdsburg USD	Fitch Mountain Elementary, K-3	\$400,000
Sonoma	Sonoma County	Juvenile Hall/Community, 7-12	\$50,000
Sonoma	Sonoma Valley USD	Flowery Elementary, K-5	\$50,000
Sonoma	Sonoma Valley USD	El Verano Elementary	\$49,996
Stanislaus	Modesto City	Tuolumne Elementary, K-6	\$50,000

**Healthy Start Support Services for Children  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District or County Office</b>	<b>School(s)</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Stanislaus	Modesto City	Franklin Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Stanislaus	Modesto City	Shackelford Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Stanislaus	Modesto City	Burbank Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Stanislaus	Newman-Crows Landing USD	Von Renner Elementary, K-5 Yolo Junior High, 6-8 West Side Valley High, 9-12	\$400,000
Stanislaus	Stanislaus County	Petersen Alternative Center, 7-12	\$400,000
Stanislaus	Turlock Joint Elementary	Wakefield Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Sutter	Yuba City USD	Bridge Street Elementary, PreK-5	\$399,990
Tehama	Corning Union High	Corning Union High, 9-12 Centennial High, 9-12	\$400,000
Tehama	Red Bluff Union Elementary	Jackson Heights Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
Trinity	Trinity Union High	Trinity High, 9-12 Alps View High, 9-12 Trinity River Community Day, 9-12	\$400,000
Tulare	Alta Vista Elementary	Alta Vista Elementary, K-8	\$399,400
Tulare	Earlimart Elementary	Earlimart Elementary, K-3 Earlimart Middle, 4-8	\$386,570
Tuolumne	Big Oak Flat-Groveland USD	Tenaya Elementary, K-8	\$50,000
Tuolumne	Jamestown Elementary	Jamestown Elementary, K-8	\$400,000
Tuolumne	Summerville Elementary	Summerville Elementary, K-8	\$50,000
Ventura	Ocean View Elementary	Tierra Vista Elementary, K-5	\$390,047
Ventura	Ventura County	Marguerite McBride Frank A Colston Juvenile Restitution Program	\$50,000
Ventura	Ventura USD	Pacific High, 9-12 El Camino High, 9-12	\$397,964
Yolo	Washington USD	Evergreen Elementary, K-6	\$400,000
Yolo	Woodland Joint USD	Grafton Elementary, K-6	\$50,000
		<b>Total</b>	<b>\$36,543,055</b>



## HIGH-RISK YOUTH EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SAFETY

**Program Description and Goals:** In 1997, the California Legislature enacted the High-Risk Youth Education and Public Safety Program (SB 1095, Lockyer) to reduce juvenile delinquency and provide early intervention programs and strategies through two distinct programs: High-Risk First-Time Offenders (HRFTO) Program and the Transitioning High-Risk Youth (THRY) Program. HRFTO Program seeks to reduce dramatically factors that contribute to chronic delinquency. THRY Program works with youth that have been committed to a detention facility and have a high risk of re-offending.

The following status report of the SB 1095 programs summarizes programmatic aspects of the funded projects, as of June 2000. Nine agencies operate SB 1095 programs and serve approximately 6,000 students. All programs are still in the developmental stage and this population will continue to increase. These agencies include eight county offices of education and one school district. All agencies have support and involvement from their probation departments and most have some involvement from community-based organizations. The following chart identifies the participating agencies and the programs they operate:

**Alameda COE:**

First-Time Offender (\$1,200,000)

Transitioning High-Risk Youth  
(\$600,000)

**Chico USD:**

First-Time Offender (\$522,000)

**Fresno COE:**

**Transitioning High-Risk  
Youth (\$250,000)**

**Imperial COE:**

First-Time Offender (\$540,000)

Transitioning High-Risk Youth  
(\$250,000)

**Kern COE:**

First-Time Offender (\$288,000)

Transitioning High-Risk Youth  
(\$210,000)

**Los Angeles COE:**

First-Time Offender (\$3,390,000)

Transitioning High-Risk Youth  
(\$7,910,000)

**Orange COE:**

First-Time Offender (\$360,000)

Transitioning High-Risk Youth  
(\$750,000)

**Placer COE:**

First-Time Offender (\$240,000)

Transitioning High-Risk Youth  
(\$200,000)

**San Diego COE:**

First-Time Offender (\$360,000)

Transitioning High-Risk Youth  
(\$300,000)

Each agency has tailored a unique combination of strategies designed for the need in its area. Common strategies include after-school programs, tutoring, mentoring, anger management, conflict resolution, substance abuse prevention, individual and group counseling, family counseling, strong probation involvement, career development, Saturday programs, and life skills training. An extensive evaluation, conducted by an independent evaluator, will identify the actual successes of the programs within the next 12-18 months.

**Statutory Authority:** *Education Code* sections 47750 et seq.

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** The ongoing, annual Budget Act local assistance general fund appropriation for the High-Risk First-Time Offenders Program is \$18 million per year, which supports programs in nine counties. There is an additional annual \$650,000 appropriation from the General Fund for evaluation of the project.

**Population Served:** The directly-served clientele of the High-Risk Youth Program fall into two distinct categories: First-Time Offenders and Transitioning High-Risk Youth. The First-Time Offender Program serves youth 15 years of age or younger who are on probation and meet three of the four risk factors as determined by probation. The Transitioning High-Risk Youth Program serves youth who are 18 years of age or younger and have been sentenced by the courts for at least six months and served at least 90 days in a youth facility. Approximately 4,000 Transitioning High-Risk Youth students and 2,000 First-Time Offenders are served in a school year in the after-school programming.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** An independent evaluator for this program has established an extensive evaluation process. To date, the evaluator has established a profile of the students involved in the program. CDE anticipates that statistics relating to the actual success of the program will be available within the next 12-18 months. Three sites have been identified as intensive evaluation sites with both experimental groups and control groups. This intensive evaluation will give us the necessary data to compare the success of those students served with the services of the High-Risk Youth Program with those students not involved in an after-school program.

**Contact Person:** Bill Lane, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 323-5721;  
e-mail: [blane@cde.ca.gov](mailto:blane@cde.ca.gov)

## SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

**Program Description and Goals:** The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA), Title IV of Improving America's Schools Act, provides funding to States, local education agencies (LEAs), and other public entities and nonprofit organizations for programs to create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly schools. SDFSCA has two goals: (1) educating and enabling America's youth to reject illegal drugs, alcohol, and tobacco; and (2) ensuring that every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol. Schools must provide a drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environment for all students, if all students are to live healthy lives and achieve high academic standards. SDFSCA programs are most effective when they are based on a thorough assessment of objective data about the drug and violence problems in schools and communities, designed to meet measurable goals and objectives, based on sound research or evaluation findings, and evaluated regularly and held accountable for results.

Authorized strategies and expenditures include mentoring, comprehensive health education, family counseling, conflict resolution and youth mediation programs, service learning, hate-motivated violence prevention, coordinated family service delivery models, and school security personnel. The California Department of Education (CDE) supports this federal focus through strong collaboration between the Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office (SSVP) and the Healthy Kids Program Office (HKP).

CDE provides leadership and assistance in promoting safe, orderly school environments, supportive law enforcement partnerships; promotes positive connections among youth, schools, and the community; and encourages programs to keep youth free of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. The delivery system of the SSVP and the HKP includes:

- *Policy/Leadership and Technical Program Support*—consultation, resources, and training to LEAs on safe schools and violence prevention programs by SSVP staff and alcohol, tobacco, and other drug programs by HKP staff.

SSVP provides: training about regional hate-motivated behavior education; grants for student leadership projects; dissemination of effective violence prevention programs and practices; coordination of School/Law Enforcement Partnership Cadre activities with the Attorney General's Office; and monthly distribution of safe schools resource materials to Title IV County Prevention Coordinators.

HKP provides: county leadership grants; various annual SDFSCA/Tobacco Use Prevention Education (TUPE) entitlements and grants; dissemination of research-based and innovative or promising prevention programs; and regular distribution of various alcohol, tobacco, and other drug prevention program resource materials to Title IV County Prevention Coordinators.

- *Curriculum Support*—SSVP and HKP jointly provide program resource information to the California Healthy Kids Resource Center (Alameda County Office of Education) and the California Healthy Kids Program Dissemination Center (Los Angeles County Office of Education) for LEAs to access.

**Statutory Authority:** Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, Title IV, Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-382).

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** Of the nearly \$40 million SDFSCA federal funding allocated to the California Department of Education in 1999-2000, 91 percent is allocated for local assistance. Seventy percent of the local assistance is distributed to school districts based on K-12 student enrollment. Thirty percent is distributed to 10 percent of LEAs based on greatest need. The balance of SDFSCA funding is allocated to technical assistance and State operations/administration.

**Population Served:** All K-12 students, including in particular high-risk youth, can benefit from the Safe and Drug-Free Schools/TUPE Programs implemented in schools statewide.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** Federal statute requires LEAs receiving SDFSCA funding to conduct an objective analysis, develop measurable goals, and publicly report progress toward these goals. The U.S. Department of Education requires that programs follow four *principles of effectiveness*: conducting needs assessment, establishing measurable objectives, implementing research-based programs, and using evaluation results to improve program effectiveness. The *principles of effectiveness* require the LEA to establish performance indicators (measurable objectives) with the assistance of a local advisory council. As part of this requirement, LEAs are required to select program performance indicators, included in the Consolidated Application, Part II. Data sources available to the LEAs in establishing the performance indicators and measuring them include: the California Healthy Kids Survey, California Safe Schools Assessment, and other reliable surveys.

Additionally, schools receiving Title IV funding complete an annual report on alcohol, tobacco, and other drug and violence prevention. CDE compiles local data into a report that provides information for statewide accountability and that shows the valuable services provided by the LEAs. The data allows the CDE, U.S. Department of Education, LEAs, and other interested parties to learn about the types of programs being used throughout the state.

**Contact Persons:** Jerry Hardenburg, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 323-1025;  
e-mail: jhardenb@cde.ca.gov; (*Safe schools and violence prevention issues*)

Greg Wolfe, School Health Education Consultant, (916) 657-3040;  
e-mail: gwolfe@cde.ca.gov. (*Drug, alcohol and tobacco prevention issues*)



## SCHOOL COMMUNITY POLICING PARTNERSHIP

**Program Description and Goals:** The School Community Policing Partnership (SCPP) Act of 1998 established a competitive grant program that funds local education agencies and their law enforcement partners to implement or expand a school community policing approach to school crime and safety issues. The School/Law Enforcement Partnership, a joint venture of the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Office of the Attorney General (AG), administers the program and awards grants to local education agencies (LEAs) and consortia of LEAs. There are currently 64 SCPP sites in California in elementary, middle, and high schools, and they focus on problem solving and partnering for school and community-wide populations.

The School Community Policing Partnership Act the Legislature mandates specific operational, managerial, and evaluative activities. In addition to formation of a collaborative partnership, SCPPs are required to:

- Identify problems through a needs assessment which incorporates the results of the California Safe School Assessment.
- Identify the school communities that face a significant risk of school and community crime or youth behavior problems.
- Identify existing school and community resources and mobilize them to meet the identified community needs.
- Identify outcome measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.
- Develop and implement locally-appropriate solutions to the identified problems.
- Develop information and intelligence sharing systems to ensure that actions by schools and local law enforcement are fully coordinated.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the chosen solutions and modify the program as necessary.
- Ensure that the collaborative partnership continues to work over the long term to provide solutions to school-community needs.

**Statutory Authority:** *Education Code* sections 32296 et seq.

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** The Budget Act local assistance appropriation for the SCPP program is \$10 million per year. Grantees are awarded \$300,000 over a three-year period. Grantees may also receive one-time startup funds of \$25,000, if needed.

**Population Served:** Given that these are school-wide projects, we expect 121,000 students to be served. Please see attached for specific list of grantees by county, district, grant amount awarded, school site and target population.

Section 32296.3 of the *Education Code* identifies two specific program activities which are key components of “school community policing” programs:

- “...law enforcement becomes an integral facet of the school community with highly trained law enforcement officers having a visible and active presence on and around school campuses, and
- ... law enforcement officers work with pupils during and after school, providing opportunities for pupils’ active involvement in positive activities.”

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** CDE staff have provided an annual report and self-evaluation format for SCPP sites to complete. Sites report the progress made on school wide outcomes by comparing the school-level data from the year before the SCPP grant. Included in school wide data are school crime, school attendance, disciplinary actions and grades as an optional category. The self-evaluation provides information regarding the law enforcement partnership and the collaborative’s decision-making process. The self-evaluation also identifies project accomplishments on a day-to-day basis. The information should include, but not be limited to, the following criteria:

- Number of project personnel and their roles and responsibilities
- Basic set of services/activities provided to students, schools, community
- Program accomplishment and the timeline planned
- Differences in services available to identified school from those available to other schools

**Contact Person:** Yvette T. Rowlett, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 445-5737;  
e-mail: yrowlett@cde.ca.gov

**School Community Policing Partnership Grantees  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Sites</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	Baldwin Park USD	Sierra Vista	\$315,000
Alameda	Berkeley USD	King, Longfellow, Willard	\$325,000
Alameda	Castro Valley USD	Castro Valley H.S.	\$325,000
Alameda	Oakland USD	1 HS, 1 Alt., 1 Middle, 2 Elem.	\$325,000
Alpine	King City Joint Union HSD	Greenfield HS	\$325,000
Alpine	King City Joint Union HSD	King City HS	\$325,000
Amador	North Monterey County USD	Bambetta Middle, Moss Landing	\$325,000
Butte County	Butte COE	Las Plumas, Oroville & Prospect	\$325,000
Colusa	Colusa COE	District-wide	\$324,521
Colusa	Moorpark USD	Moorpark HS	\$190,000
El Dorado	El Dorado Union HSD	El Dorado HS	\$325,000
Fresno	Sanger USD	Sanger HS	\$325,000
Glenn	Calexico USD	6 Elem., 2 Junior HS, 2 HS	\$272,000
Imperial	Imperial COE	Westmorland, Meadows	\$318,700
Kern	Bakersfield City SD	Johnson HS, Emerson Middle	\$323,132
Kern	Kernville Union SD	5 School Sites	\$325,000
Kern	Santa Cruz COE	Alt. Education Program	\$325,000
Kings	Monterey Peninsula USD	District-wide	\$325,000
Kings	Reef-Sunset USD	All Schools	\$325,000
Lake	Fillmore USD	Fillmore HS, Fillmore Middle	\$296,488
Lassen	Perris Union HSD	District-wide	\$325,000
Los Angeles	Inglewood USD	18 School Sites	\$319,700
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	1 Middle School	\$325,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Southgate Cluster	\$325,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Washington/Lennox	\$325,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles USD	Woodrow Wilson HS	\$325,000
Madera	Irvine USD	S.E.L.F. Alt. HS	\$325,000
Mendocino	Wasco Union Elementary SD	3 Elem., 1 Middle, 1 HS	\$185,606
Merced	Bonita USD	13 Schools	\$259,350
Merced	Merced COE	Valley Community School	\$325,000
Merced	Merced COE	Valley, Atwater Castle	\$325,000
Modoc	Delana USD	Cecil Ave., Middle, Del Vista	\$325,000
Modoc	Delano USD	Almond Tree Middle, Fremont	\$325,000
Monterey	Greenfield Union SD	9 schools	\$325,000
Monterey	San Ramon Valley USD	District-wide	\$314,000
Orange	Irvine USD	Irvine HS	\$325,000

**School Community Policing Partnership Grantees  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Sites</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Orange	Orange COE/ Garden Grove USD	District-wide	\$324,994
Orange	Orange COE/Saddleback Valley	4 School Districts	\$324,993
Orange	Santa Ana USD	3 Elem., 2 Intermediates	\$225,000
Placer	Placer COE	Auburn Community	\$325,000
Placer	Placer COE	Rocklin Community	\$325,000
Riverside	Corona/Norco USD	Auburndale and Raney	\$325,000
Sacramento	North Sacramento SD	10 Elementary Schools	\$325,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	3 School Cluster	\$325,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	Albert Einstein, Feeder Sc.	\$325,000
Sacramento	Sacramento City USD	Fern Bacon, Feeder Sc.	\$325,000
Sacramento	Sacramento COE	330 School Sites	\$320,000
Sacramento	San Juan USD	Encino, 1 Middle, 4 Elem.	\$325,000
San Diego	San Diego USD	O'Farrell Community	\$325,000
San Joaquin	Lincoln USD	13 School Sites	\$325,000
San Joaquin	Linden USD	4 School Sites	\$325,000
San Joaquin	Lodi USD	Clairmont	\$325,000
San Joaquin	San Joaquin COE	4 School Sites	\$325,000
San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo COE	2 Community Schools	\$268,518
Santa Clara	East Side Union HS	Andrew Hill	\$325,000
Santa Clara	East Side Union HSD	Piedmont Hills	\$325,000
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale SD	Columbia	\$325,000
Shasta	Redding SD	Juniper	\$325,000
Solano	Vallejo USD	4 HS, 4 Middle	\$325,000
Sonoma	Sonoma COE	Santa Rosa Community School	\$321,000
Tulare	Cutler-Orosi Joint USD	Orosi, Lovell, Yettem, El Monte	\$325,000
Tulare	La Mesa Spring Valley SD	Spring Valley, La Presa	\$325,000
Tulare	Pixley Union SD	Pixley School	\$305,067
Tulare	Woodlake Union Schools	Woodlake Union High	\$300,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$20,133,069</b>

## **SCHOOL SAFETY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION (AB 1113, AB 658)**

**Program Description and Goals:** The School Safety and Violence Prevention Act, established in 1999, provided \$71.1 million in ongoing and \$28.9 million in one-time state funds for school safety grants to districts maintaining any of grades 8-12. An additional \$1 million was provided for county offices of education. To obtain the allocation, districts certify that they have developed a school safety plan and worked in school/community collaborations to identify priorities for their schools. The Legislature's stated goals for the School Safety and Violence Prevention Act are to promote school safety and reduce school site violence. School districts may use money for the following purposes:

- provide schools with personnel including licensed or certificated school counselors, school social workers, school nurses, and school psychologists who are trained in conflict resolution, and sworn peace officers;
- provide on-campus communication devices and safety infrastructure needs;
- establish in-service training programs for school staff to identify, work with and refer to services those students who may be high risk;
- establish cooperative partnerships with law enforcement agencies for school community needs;
- implement other strategies that meet goals and objectives of school safety and violence prevention.

The role of the Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office (SSVP) in the School Safety and Violence Prevention program is to provide informational assistance to districts, particularly to clarify the required collaborative process and funding priorities. Beginning spring 2001, SSVP will develop an annual report to identify the nature of district expenditures statewide and to assess the kinds of programs that are created to meet school safety needs.

**Statutory Authority:** *Education Code* sections 32228 et seq.

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** The 2000-01 Budget Act appropriation for the School Safety and Violence Prevention Act program is \$71.1 million per year, for school districts which include grades 8-12 enrollment, and \$1 million for county offices of education. The funding is ongoing.

**Population Served:** The directly-served clientele of the School Safety and Violence Prevention Act program are students and staff of districts that include grades 8-12. Some program activities are aimed specifically at identifying "high-risk" students, while most others are designed for the entire population of students in a school. All but 105 of the 1,045 school districts have participated in funding, and the program includes nearly 6 million students annually.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** Legislation does not require evaluations of the School Safety and Violence Prevention Act funding, but requests an annual report from the Superintendent of Public Instruction. A first year report will provide a statewide summary of initial expenditures and assess how the funds were used by school districts. It will be available by December 2000.

**Contact Person:** Louise Chiatovich, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 445-5695;  
e-mail: lchiatov@cde.ca.gov

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
County Offices of Education**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	Alameda County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Amador	Amador County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Butte	Butte County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Calaveras	Calaveras County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Colusa	Colusa County Office Of Education	\$20,000
Contra Costa	Contra Costa County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Del Norte	Del Norte County Office Of Education	\$10,000
El Dorado	El Dorado County Office Of Education	\$20,000
Fresno	Fresno County Office Of Education	\$13,206
Glenn	Glenn County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Humboldt	Humboldt County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Imperial	Imperial County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Inyo	Inyo County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Kern	Kern County Office Of Education	\$20,403
Kings	Kings County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Lake	Lake County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Lassen	Lassen County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Los Angeles	Los Angeles County Office Of Education	\$162,459
Madera	Madera County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Marin	Marin County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Mariposa	Mariposa County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Mendocino	Mendocino County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Merced	Merced County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Modoc	Modoc County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Mono	Mono County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Monterey	Monterey County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Napa	Napa County Office Of Education	\$25,000
Nevada	Nevada County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Orange	Orange County Office Of Education	\$67,541
Placer	Placer County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Plumas	Plumas County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Riverside	Riverside County Office Of Education	\$31,359
Sacramento	Sacramento County Office Of Education	\$13,681
San Benito	San Benito County Office Of Education	\$10,000
San Bernardino	San Bernardino County Office Of Education	\$27,558

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
County Offices of Education**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
San Diego	San Diego County Office Of Education	\$34,699
San Francisco	San Francisco County Office Of Education	\$14,058
San Joaquin	San Joaquin County Office Of Education	\$23,883
San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo County Office Of Education	\$10,000
San Mateo	San Mateo County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara County Education Office	\$10,000
Santa Clara	Santa Clara County Office Of Education	\$26,119
Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Shasta	Shasta County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Sierra	Sierra County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Siskiyou County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Solano	Solano County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Sonoma	Sonoma County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Stanislaus County Office Of Education	\$20,000
Sutter	Sutter County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Tehama	Tehama County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Trinity	Trinity County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Tulare	Tulare County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Tuolumne	Tuolumne County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Ventura	Ventura County Office Of Education	\$10,000
Yolo	Yolo County Office Of Education	\$15,000
Yuba	Yuba County Office Of Education	\$10,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$999,966</b>

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	Alameda City Unified	\$198,293
Alameda	Albany Unified	\$54,883
Alameda	Berkeley Unified	\$188,108
Alameda	Castro Valley Unified	\$148,430
Alameda	Dublin Unified	\$68,399
Alameda	Emery Unified	\$18,198
Alameda	Fremont Unified	\$547,961
Alameda	Hayward Unified	\$369,072
Alameda	Livermore Valley Joint Unified	\$229,524
Alameda	New Haven Unified	\$268,381
Alameda	Newark Unified	\$140,369
Alameda	Oakland Unified	\$745,675
Alameda	Piedmont City Unified	\$54,690
Alameda	Pleasanton Unified	\$217,215
Alameda	San Leandro Unified	\$139,983
Alameda	San Lorenzo Unified	\$200,562
Alameda	Sunol Glen Unified	\$10,000
Alpine	Alpine County Unified	\$10,000
Amador	Amador County Unified	\$97,023
Butte	Bangor Union Elementary	\$10,000
Butte	Biggs Unified	\$16,315
Butte	Chico Unified	\$266,692
Butte	Durham Unified	\$27,514
Butte	Feather Falls Union Elementary	\$10,000
Butte	Golden Feather Union	\$10,000
Butte	Gridley Unified	\$39,581
Butte	Manzanita Elementary	\$10,000
Butte	Oroville City Elementary	\$18,777
Butte	Oroville Union High	\$124,537
Butte	Palermo Union	\$10,000
Butte	Paradise Unified	\$107,497
Butte	Pioneer Union Elementary	\$10,000
Butte	Thermalito Union	\$10,000
Calaveras	Bret Harte Union High	\$43,540



**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Calaveras	Calaveras Unified	\$75,108
Calaveras	Mark Twain Union Elementary	\$10,000
Calaveras	Vallecito Union Elementary	\$10,000
Colusa	Colusa Unified	\$33,017
Colusa	Maxwell Unified	\$15,000
Colusa	Pierce Joint Unified	\$22,108
Colusa	Williams Unified	\$17,619
Contra Costa	Acalanes Union High	\$244,488
Contra Costa	Antioch Unified	\$329,250
Contra Costa	Brentwood Union	\$17,377
Contra Costa	Byron Union Elementary	\$10,000
Contra Costa	Canyon Elementary	\$10,000
Contra Costa	John Swett Unified	\$43,733
Contra Costa	Knightesen Elementary	\$10,000
Contra Costa	Lafayette Elementary	\$19,356
Contra Costa	Liberty Union High	\$163,442
Contra Costa	Martinez Unified	\$81,673
Contra Costa	Moraga Elementary	\$11,778
Contra Costa	Mt. Diablo Unified	\$634,123
Contra Costa	Oakley Union Elementary	\$21,094
Contra Costa	Orinda Union Elementary	\$12,550
Contra Costa	Pittsburg Unified	\$152,002
Contra Costa	San Ramon Valley Unified	\$367,721
Contra Costa	Walnut Creek Elementary	\$17,812
Contra Costa	West Contra Costa Unified	\$539,996
Del Norte	Del Norte County Unified	\$92,003
El Dorado	Black Oak Mine Unified	\$39,630
El Dorado	Buckeye Union Elementary	\$20,466
El Dorado	Camino Union Elementary	\$10,000
El Dorado	El Dorado Union High	\$300,867
El Dorado	Gold Oak Union	\$10,000
El Dorado	Gold Trail Union	\$10,000
El Dorado	Indian Diggings Elementary	\$10,000
El Dorado	Lake Tahoe Unified	\$98,664
El Dorado	Latrobe	\$10,000

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
El Dorado	Mother Lode Union Elementary	\$10,185
El Dorado	Pioneer Union Elementary	\$10,000
El Dorado	Placerville Union Elementary	\$10,000
El Dorado	Pollock Pines Elementary	\$10,000
El Dorado	Rescue Union Elementary	\$15,302
Fresno	Alvina Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	American Union Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	Big Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	Burrell Union Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	Caruthers Unified	\$32,968
Fresno	Central Unified	\$170,007
Fresno	Clay Joint Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	Clovis Unified	\$591,742
Fresno	Coalinga/Huron Joint Unified	\$66,806
Fresno	Firebaugh-Las Deltas Unified	\$37,651
Fresno	Fowler Unified	\$38,857
Fresno	Fresno Unified	\$1,286,009
Fresno	Golden Plains Unified	\$33,934
Fresno	Kerman Unified	\$62,510
Fresno	Kings Canyon Joint Unified	\$144,520
Fresno	Kingsburg Jt Union Elem./Kingsburg Elem. Comm. Charter	\$10,668
Fresno	Kingsburg Joint Union High	\$47,980
Fresno	Laton Joint Unified	\$15,000
Fresno	Mendota Unified	\$37,988
Fresno	Monroe Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	Pacific Union Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	Parlier Unified	\$45,470
Fresno	Pine Ridge Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	Riverdale Joint Unified	\$29,010
Fresno	Sanger Unified	\$132,405
Fresno	Selma Unified	\$96,250
Fresno	Sierra Unified	\$65,116
Fresno	Washington Colony Elementary	\$10,000
Fresno	Washington Union High	\$62,220
Fresno	West Park Elementary	\$10,000

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Glenn	Capay Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
Glenn	Hamilton Union Elementary	\$10,000
Glenn	Hamilton Union High	\$11,874
Glenn	Lake Elementary	\$10,000
Glenn	Orland Joint Unified	\$42,815
Glenn	Plaza Elementary	\$10,000
Glenn	Princeton Joint Unified	\$10,000
Glenn	Stony Creek Joint Unified	\$10,000
Glenn	Willows Unified	\$35,816
Humboldt	Arcata Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Big Lagoon Union Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Blue Lake Union Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Bridgeville Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Cuddeback Union Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Eureka City Schools	\$131,729
Humboldt	Ferndale Unified	\$10,812
Humboldt	Fieldbrook Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Fortuna Union Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Fortuna Union High	\$59,758
Humboldt	Hydesville Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Jacoby Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Klamath-Trinity Joint Unified	\$35,000
Humboldt	Kneeland Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Loleta Union Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Maple Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Mattole Unified	\$15,000
Humboldt	Mckinleyville UNION ELEMENTARY	\$10,000
Humboldt	Northern Humboldt Union High	\$99,243
Humboldt	Orick Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Pacific Union Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Peninsula Union Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Rio Dell Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Rohnerville Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Scotia Union Elementary	\$10,000
Humboldt	Southern Humboldt Joint Unified	\$30,000

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Humboldt	Trinidad Union Elementary	\$10,000
Imperial	Brawley Elementary	\$18,729
Imperial	Brawley Union High	\$84,424
Imperial	Calexico Unified	\$138,921
Imperial	Calipatria Unified	\$27,128
Imperial	Central Union High	\$166,338
Imperial	El Centro Elementary	\$31,327
Imperial	Heber Elementary	\$10,000
Imperial	Holtville Unified	\$36,975
Imperial	Imperial Unified	\$41,657
Imperial	Magnolia Union Elementary	\$10,000
Imperial	Mccabe UNION ELEMENTARY	\$10,000
Imperial	Meadows Union Elementary	\$10,000
Imperial	Mulberry Elementary	\$10,000
Imperial	San Pasqual Valley Unified	\$15,109
Imperial	Seeley Union Elementary	\$10,000
Imperial	Westmorland Union Elementary	\$10,000
Inyo	Big Pine Unified	\$15,000
Inyo	Bishop Joint Union High	\$39,388
Inyo	Bishop Union Elementary	\$10,000
Inyo	Death Valley Unified	\$10,000
Inyo	Lone Pine Unified	\$10,000
Inyo	Owens Valley Unified	\$15,000
Inyo	Round Valley Joint Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Arvin Union Elementary	\$11,247
Kern	Bakersfield City Elementary	\$121,930
Kern	Beardsley Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Buttonwillow Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Caliente Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Delano Joint Union High	\$150,216
Kern	Delano Union Elementary	\$28,962
Kern	Di Giorgio Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Edison Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Elk Hills Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Fairfax Elementary	\$10,000

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Kern	Fruitvale Elementary	\$14,191
Kern	General Shafter Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Greenfield Union	\$32,920
Kern	Kern High	\$1,325,205
Kern	Kernville Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Lakeside Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Lamont Elementary	\$13,757
Kern	Linns Valley-Poso Flat Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Lost Hills Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Maple Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Maricopa Unified	\$10,000
Kern	Mckittrick ELEMENTARY	\$10,000
Kern	Mojave Unified	\$44,795
Kern	Muroc Joint Unified	\$39,050
Kern	Norris	\$10,000
Kern	Panama-Buena Vista Union	\$64,247
Kern	Pond Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Richland-Lerdo Elementary	\$11,488
Kern	Rio Bravo-Greeley Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Rosedale Union Elementary	\$18,777
Kern	Semitropic Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Sierra Sands Unified	\$112,035
Kern	South Fork Union	\$10,000
Kern	Southern Kern Unified	\$55,173
Kern	Standard Elementary	\$13,129
Kern	Taft City Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Tehachapi Unified	\$90,892
Kern	Vineland Elementary	\$10,000
Kern	Wasco Union Elementary	\$12,405
Kern	Wasco Union High	\$69,171
Kings	Armona Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kings	Central Union Elementary	\$15,000
Kings	Corcoran Joint Unified	\$54,690
Kings	Delta View Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kings	Hanford Elementary	\$25,293

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Kings	Hanford Joint Union High	\$154,705
Kings	Island Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kings	Kings River-Hardwick Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kings	Kit Carson Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kings	Lakeside Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kings	Lemoore Union Elementary	\$16,943
Kings	Lemoore Union High	\$95,816
Kings	Pioneer Union Elementary	\$10,000
Kings	Reef-Sunset Unified	\$38,616
Lake	Kelseyville Unified	\$40,595
Lake	Konocti Unified	\$51,649
Lake	Lakeport Unified	\$32,727
Lake	Lucerne Elementary	\$10,000
Lake	Middletown Unified	\$29,541
Lake	Upper Lake Union Elementary	\$10,000
Lake	Upper Lake Union High	\$17,136
Lassen	Big Valley Joint Unified	\$15,000
Lassen	Janesville Union Elementary	\$10,000
Lassen	Johnstonville Elementary	\$10,000
Lassen	Lassen Union High	\$58,165
Lassen	Richmond Elementary	\$10,000
Lassen	Shaffer Union	\$10,000
Lassen	Susanville	\$10,000
Lassen	Westwood Unified	\$15,000
Los Angeles	Abc Unified	\$436,409
Los Angeles	Acton-Agua Dulce Unified	\$32,003
Los Angeles	Alhambra City Elementary	\$65,000
Los Angeles	Alhambra City High	\$385,919
Los Angeles	Antelope Valley Union High	\$825,562
Los Angeles	Arcadia Unified	\$206,982
Los Angeles	Azusa Unified	\$183,136
Los Angeles	Baldwin Park Unified	\$272,388
Los Angeles	Bassett Unified	\$90,217
Los Angeles	Bellflower Unified	\$233,337
Los Angeles	Beverly Hills Unified	\$124,344

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Los Angeles	Bonita Unified	\$198,293
Los Angeles	Burbank Unified	\$265,871
Los Angeles	Castaic Union	\$11,054
Los Angeles	Centinela Valley Union High	\$318,341
Los Angeles	Charter Oak Unified	\$121,496
Los Angeles	Claremont Unified	\$137,376
Los Angeles	Compton Unified	\$393,207
Los Angeles	Covina-Valley Unified	\$259,451
Los Angeles	Culver City Unified	\$112,710
Los Angeles	Downey Unified	\$366,176
Los Angeles	Duarte Unified	\$69,074
Los Angeles	East Whittier City Elementary	\$40,692
Los Angeles	Eastside Union	\$10,000
Los Angeles	El Monte City	\$50,732
Los Angeles	El Monte Union High	\$457,358
Los Angeles	El Rancho Unified	\$192,887
Los Angeles	El Segundo Unified	\$55,993
Los Angeles	Garvey Elementary	\$33,837
Los Angeles	Glendale Unified	\$590,197
Los Angeles	Glendora Unified	\$153,788
Los Angeles	Gorman Elementary	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Hacienda La Puente Unified	\$406,771
Los Angeles	Hawthorne	\$39,099
Los Angeles	Hermosa Beach City Elementary	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Hughes-Elizabeth Lakes Union Elementary	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Inglewood Unified	\$231,744
Los Angeles	Keppel Union Elementary	\$13,612
Los Angeles	La Canada Unified	\$81,769
Los Angeles	Lancaster Elementary	\$62,220
Los Angeles	Las Virgenes Unified	\$219,339
Los Angeles	Lawndale Elementary	\$23,556
Los Angeles	Lennox Elementary	\$26,790
Los Angeles	Little Lake City Elementary	\$24,811
Los Angeles	Long Beach Unified	\$1,408,808
Los Angeles	Los Angeles Unified	\$10,679,496

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Los Angeles	Los Nietos Elementary	\$10,040
Los Angeles	Lowell Joint Elementary	\$17,956
Los Angeles	Lynwood Unified	\$256,024
Los Angeles	Manhattan Beach Unified	\$118,117
Los Angeles	Monrovia Unified	\$109,428
Los Angeles	Montebello Unified	\$556,650
Los Angeles	Mountain View Elementary	\$39,726
Los Angeles	Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	\$361,253
Los Angeles	Palmdale Elementary	\$89,782
Los Angeles	Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified	\$180,482
Los Angeles	Paramount Unified	\$244,246
Los Angeles	Pasadena Unified	\$374,527
Los Angeles	Pomona Unified	\$457,310
Los Angeles	Redondo Beach Unified	\$128,398
Los Angeles	Rosemead Elementary	\$16,750
Los Angeles	Rowland Unified	\$321,189
Los Angeles	San Gabriel Unified	\$89,734
Los Angeles	San Marino Unified	\$66,516
Los Angeles	Santa Monica-Malibu Unified	\$227,255
Los Angeles	South Pasadena Unified	\$79,163
Los Angeles	Temple City Unified	\$104,070
Los Angeles	Torrance Unified	\$458,372
Los Angeles	Valle Lindo Elementary	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Walnut Valley Unified	\$320,223
Los Angeles	West Covina Unified	\$163,056
Los Angeles	Westside Union Elementary	\$36,830
Los Angeles	Whittier City	\$32,534
Los Angeles	Whittier Union High	\$509,152
Los Angeles	William S. Hart Union High	\$604,630
Los Angeles	Wilsona	\$10,000
Los Angeles	Wiseburn Elementary	\$10,000
Madera	Alview-Dairyland Union Elementary	\$10,000
Madera	Bass Lake Joint Union Elementary	\$25,000
Madera	Chawanakee Joint	\$20,000
Madera	Chowchilla Elementary	\$10,000



**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Madera	Chowchilla Union High	\$40,305
Madera	Coarsegold Union	\$10,000
Madera	Madera Unified	\$267,850
Madera	Minarets Joint Union High	\$10,000
Madera	Raymond-Knowles Union Elementary	\$10,000
Madera	Yosemite Union High School District	\$62,558
Marin	Bolinas-Stinson Union School District	\$10,000
Marin	Dixie Elementary	\$11,874
Marin	Kentfield Elementary	\$10,000
Marin	Lagunitas Elementary	\$10,000
Marin	Larkspur Elementary	\$10,000
Marin	Mill Valley Elementary	\$10,764
Marin	Nicasio Elementary	\$10,000
Marin	Novato Unified	\$139,693
Marin	Reed Union Elementary	\$10,000
Marin	Ross Elementary	\$10,000
Marin	Ross Valley	\$10,000
Marin	San Rafael City Elementary	\$15,736
Marin	San Rafael City High	\$92,534
Marin	Sausalito Elementary	\$10,000
Marin	Shoreline Unified	\$25,000
Marin	Tamalpais Union High	\$165,952
Mariposa	Mariposa County Unified	\$51,214
Mendocino	Anderson Valley Unified	\$11,633
Mendocino	Arena Union Elementary	\$10,000
Mendocino	Fort Bragg Unified	\$45,567
Mendocino	Laytonville Unified	\$20,000
Mendocino	Leggett Valley Unified	\$20,000
Mendocino	Manchester Union Elementary	\$10,000
Mendocino	Mendocino Unified	\$25,000
Mendocino	Point Arena Joint Union High	\$11,102
Mendocino	Potter Valley Community Unified	\$15,000
Mendocino	Round Valley Unified	\$20,000
Mendocino	Ukiah Unified	\$132,984
Mendocino	Willits Unified	\$48,029

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Merced	Atwater Elementary	\$22,204
Merced	Ballico-Cressey Elementary	\$10,000
Merced	Delhi Unified	\$23,604
Merced	Dos Palos Oro-Loma Joint Unified	\$47,063
Merced	El Nido Elementary	\$10,000
Merced	Gustine Unified	\$27,997
Merced	Hilmar Unified	\$46,822
Merced	Le Grand Union Elementary	\$10,000
Merced	Le Grand Union High	\$25,921
Merced	Livingston Union	\$12,019
Merced	Los Banos Unified	\$115,365
Merced	Mcswain UNION ELEMENTARY	\$10,000
Merced	Merced City Elementary	\$56,717
Merced	Merced River Union Elementary	\$10,000
Merced	Merced Union High	\$441,381
Merced	Plainsburg Union Elementary	\$10,000
Merced	Planada Elementary	\$10,000
Merced	Snelling-Merced Falls Union Elementary	\$10,000
Merced	Weaver Union	\$10,000
Merced	Winton Elementary	\$10,000
Modoc	Modoc Joint Unified	\$21,625
Modoc	Surprise Valley Joint Unified	\$15,000
Modoc	Tulelake Basin Joint Unified	\$11,537
Mono	Eastern Sierra Unified	\$40,000
Mono	Mammoth Unified	\$20,804
Monterey	Bradley Union Elementary	\$10,000
Monterey	Carmel Unified	\$46,774
Monterey	Chualar Union Elementary	\$10,000
Monterey	Gonzales Unified	\$66,854
Monterey	Graves Elementary	\$10,000
Monterey	Greenfield Union Elementary	\$12,792
Monterey	King City Joint Union High	\$94,223
Monterey	King City Union Elementary	\$10,000
Monterey	Mission Union Elementary	\$10,000
Monterey	Monterey Peninsula Unified	\$204,134

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Monterey	North Monterey County Unified	\$101,801
Monterey	Pacific Grove Unified	\$43,153
Monterey	Pacific Unified	\$10,000
Monterey	Salinas Union High	\$476,956
Monterey	San Ardo Union Elementary	\$10,000
Monterey	San Lucas Union Elementary	\$10,000
Monterey	Santa Rita Union Elementary	\$13,853
Monterey	Soledad Unified	\$17,812
Monterey	Spreckels Union	\$10,000
Monterey	Washington Union Elementary	\$10,000
Napa	Calistoga Joint Unified	\$15,109
Napa	Howell Mountain Elementary	\$10,000
Napa	Napa Valley Unified	\$292,854
Napa	Pope Valley Union	\$10,000
Napa	St. Helena Unified	\$34,175
Nevada	Chicago Park Elementary	\$10,000
Nevada	Clear Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Nevada	Grass Valley Elementary	\$12,985
Nevada	Nevada City	\$10,000
Nevada	Nevada Joint Union High	\$224,745
Nevada	Pleasant Ridge Union Elementary	\$12,261
Nevada	Pleasant Valley Elementary	\$10,000
Nevada	Ready Springs Union	\$10,000
Nevada	Twin Ridges Elementary	\$20,000
Nevada	Union Hill Elementary	\$10,000
Orange	Anaheim Union High	\$1,094,233
Orange	Brea Olinda Unified	\$120,241
Orange	Buena Park Elementary	\$21,528
Orange	Capistrano Unified	\$676,552
Orange	Fountain	\$34,947
Orange	Fullerton Elementary	\$62,799
Orange	Fullerton Joint Union High	\$700,205
Orange	Garden Grove Unified	\$780,333
Orange	Huntington Beach City Elementary	\$34,754
Orange	Huntington Beach Union High	\$687,027

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Orange	Irvine Unified	\$442,201
Orange	La Habra City Elementary	\$26,066
Orange	Laguna Beach Unified	\$47,256
Orange	Los Alamitos Unified	\$176,910
Orange	Newport-Mesa Unified	\$356,136
Orange	Ocean View Elementary	\$50,539
Orange	Orange Unified	\$487,430
Orange	Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified	\$447,415
Orange	Saddleback Valley Unified	\$574,461
Orange	Santa Ana Unified	\$791,097
Orange	Tustin Unified	\$256,265
Orange	Westminster Elementary	\$41,078
Placer	Ackerman Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Alta-Dutch Flat Union Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Auburn Union Elementary	\$15,977
Placer	Colfax Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Dry Creek Joint Elementary	\$22,783
Placer	Emigrant Gap Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Eureka Union Elementary	\$22,108
Placer	Foresthill Union Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Loomis Union Elementary	\$10,619
Placer	Newcastle Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Ophir Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Penryn Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Placer Hills Union Elementary	\$10,000
Placer	Placer Union High	\$226,241
Placer	Rocklin Unified	\$107,932
Placer	Roseville City Elementary	\$32,582
Placer	Roseville Joint Union High	\$314,479
Placer	Tahoe-Truckee Unified	\$84,328
Placer	Western Placer Unified	\$57,586
Plumas	Plumas Unified	\$69,702
Riverside	Alvord Unified	\$279,290
Riverside	Beaumont Unified	\$60,289
Riverside	Coachella Valley Unified	\$181,254

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Riverside	Corona-Norco Unified	\$567,993
Riverside	Desert Sands Unified	\$394,656
Riverside	Hemet Unified	\$290,778
Riverside	Jurupa Unified	\$310,376
Riverside	Lake Elsinore Unified	\$260,658
Riverside	Moreno Valley Unified	\$567,124
Riverside	Murrieta Valley Unified	\$171,552
Riverside	Nuview Union	\$10,000
Riverside	Palm Springs Unified	\$316,458
Riverside	Palo Verde Unified	\$65,502
Riverside	Perris Union High	\$236,426
Riverside	Riverside Unified	\$659,079
Riverside	Romoland Elementary	\$10,000
Riverside	San Jacinto Unified	\$78,294
Riverside	Temecula Valley Unified	\$278,711
Riverside	Val Verde Unified	\$146,934
Sacramento	Arcohe Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sacramento	Center Unified	\$97,023
Sacramento	Elk Grove Unified	\$759,866
Sacramento	Elverta Joint Elementary	\$10,000
Sacramento	Folsom-Cordova Unified	\$239,033
Sacramento	Galt Joint Union Elementary	\$18,150
Sacramento	Galt Joint Union High	\$88,382
Sacramento	Grant Joint Union High	\$448,621
Sacramento	Natomas Unified	\$86,500
Sacramento	Rio Linda Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sacramento	River Delta Unified	\$46,387
Sacramento	Sacramento City Unified	\$829,568
Sacramento	San Juan Unified	\$897,050
San Benito	Aromas/San Juan Unified	\$19,405
San Benito	Bitterwater-Tully Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Benito	Cienega Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Benito	Hollister Elementary	\$29,300
San Benito	Jefferson Elementary	\$10,000
San Benito	North County Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
San Benito	Panoche Elementary	\$10,000
San Benito	San Benito High	\$128,929
San Benito	Southside Elementary	\$10,000
San Benito	Tres Pinos Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Bernardino	Adelanto Elementary	\$16,750
San Bernardino	Alta Loma Elementary	\$45,470
San Bernardino	Apple Valley Unified	\$213,546
San Bernardino	Baker Valley Unified	\$10,000
San Bernardino	Barstow Unified	\$115,462
San Bernardino	Bear Valley Unified	\$64,006
San Bernardino	Central Elementary	\$25,969
San Bernardino	Chaffey Joint Union High	\$898,546
San Bernardino	Chino Valley Unified	\$542,893
San Bernardino	Colton Joint Unified	\$328,767
San Bernardino	Cucamonga Elementary	\$12,164
San Bernardino	Etiwanda Elementary	\$32,437
San Bernardino	Fontana Unified	\$543,182
San Bernardino	Helendale	\$10,000
San Bernardino	Hesperia Unified	\$271,953
San Bernardino	Lucerne Valley Unified	\$20,000
San Bernardino	Morongo Unified	\$158,229
San Bernardino	Mountain View Elementary	\$15,591
San Bernardino	Mt. Baldy Joint Elementary	\$10,000
San Bernardino	Needles Unified	\$25,000
San Bernardino	Ontario-Montclair	\$110,683
San Bernardino	Redlands Unified	\$347,689
San Bernardino	Rialto Unified	\$424,293
San Bernardino	Rim Of The World Unified	\$121,882
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City Unified	\$746,496
San Bernardino	Silver Valley Unified	\$38,423
San Bernardino	Snowline Joint Unified	\$153,064
San Bernardino	Trona Joint Unified	\$10,000
San Bernardino	Upland Unified	\$212,629
San Bernardino	Victor Valley Union High	\$279,725
San Bernardino	Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified	\$165,180

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
San Diego	Alpine Union	\$12,261
San Diego	Bonsall Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Diego	Borrego Springs Unified	\$15,000
San Diego	Cajon Valley Union Elementary	\$96,106
San Diego	Carlsbad Unified	\$152,002
San Diego	Coronado Unified	\$54,062
San Diego	Escondido Union Elementary	\$81,383
San Diego	Escondido Union High	\$381,526
San Diego	Fallbrook Union Elementary	\$28,479
San Diego	Fallbrook Union High	\$129,605
San Diego	Grossmont Union High	\$1,121,505
San Diego	Jamul-Dulzura Union School District	\$10,000
San Diego	Julian Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Diego	Julian Union High	\$11,488
San Diego	La Mesa-Spring Valley	\$73,177
San Diego	Lakeside Union Elementary	\$25,004
San Diego	Lemon Grove Elementary	\$21,866
San Diego	Mountain Empire Unified	\$33,017
San Diego	Oceanside Unified	\$313,224
San Diego	Pauma Elementary	\$10,000
San Diego	Poway Unified	\$605,644
San Diego	Ramona Unified	\$131,101
San Diego	San Diego Unified	\$2,055,819
San Diego	San Dieguito Union High	\$389,201
San Diego	San Marcos Unified	\$182,702
San Diego	San Pasqual Union	\$10,000
San Diego	San Ysidro Elementary	\$16,895
San Diego	Santee Elementary	\$50,000
San Diego	Sweetwater Union High	\$1,332,107
San Diego	Vallecitos	\$10,000
San Diego	Vista Unified	\$418,694
San Diego	Warner Unified	\$10,000
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	\$1,102,873
San Joaquin	Banta Elementary	\$10,000
San Joaquin	Escalon Unified	\$57,393

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
San Joaquin	Holt Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Joaquin	Jefferson Elementary	\$10,000
San Joaquin	Lammersville Elementary	\$10,000
San Joaquin	Lincoln Unified	\$161,849
San Joaquin	Linden Unified	\$45,470
San Joaquin	Lodi Unified	\$491,147
San Joaquin	Manteca Unified	\$289,427
San Joaquin	New Hope Elementary	\$10,000
San Joaquin	New Jerusalem Elementary	\$10,000
San Joaquin	Oak View Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Joaquin	Ripon Unified	\$43,395
San Joaquin	Stockton Unified	\$551,871
San Joaquin	Tracy Joint Unified	\$230,586
San Luis Obispo	Atascadero Unified	\$116,186
San Luis Obispo	Cayucos Elementary	\$10,000
San Luis Obispo	Coast Unified	\$23,363
San Luis Obispo	Lucia Mar Unified	\$193,273
San Luis Obispo	Paso Robles Joint Unified	\$120,868
San Luis Obispo	Pleasant Valley Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Luis Obispo	San Luis Coastal Unified	\$164,456
San Luis Obispo	San Miguel Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
San Luis Obispo	Shandon Joint Unified	\$10,000
San Luis Obispo	Templeton Unified	\$50,056
San Mateo	Bayshore Elementary	\$10,000
San Mateo	Belmont-Redwood Shores Elementary	\$11,681
San Mateo	Brisbane Elementary	\$10,000
San Mateo	Burlingame Elementary	\$14,047
San Mateo	Cabrillo Unified	\$70,860
San Mateo	Hillsborough City	\$10,000
San Mateo	Jefferson Elementary	\$39,823
San Mateo	Jefferson Union High	\$268,236
San Mateo	La Honda-Pescadero Unified	\$15,000
San Mateo	Laguna Salada Union Elementary	\$20,000
San Mateo	Las Lomitas Elementary	\$10,000
San Mateo	Menlo Park City Elementary	\$10,000



**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
San Mateo	Millbrae Elementary	\$13,226
San Mateo	Ravenswood City Elementary	\$35,000
San Mateo	Redwood City Elementary	\$40,836
San Mateo	San Bruno Park	\$13,419
San Mateo	San Carlos Elementary	\$11,440
San Mateo	San Mateo Union High	\$407,254
San Mateo	San Mateo-Foster City	\$51,359
San Mateo	Sequoia Union High	\$352,274
San Mateo	South San Francisco Unified	\$194,818
San Mateo	Woodside Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Blochman Union Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Buellton Union Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Carpinteria Unified	\$53,242
Santa Barbara	Casmalia Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	College Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Cuyama Joint Unified	\$15,000
Santa Barbara	Guadalupe Union Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Lompoc Unified	\$188,012
Santa Barbara	Los Alamos Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Los Olivos Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Barbara	Orcutt Union Elementary	\$29,783
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara High	\$375,975
Santa Barbara	Santa Maria Joint Union High	\$285,855
Santa Barbara	Santa Maria-Bonita	\$44,795
Santa Barbara	Santa Ynez Valley Union High	\$52,807
Santa Barbara	Solvang Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Clara	Alum Rock Union Elementary	\$75,156
Santa Clara	Berryessa Union Elementary	\$46,581
Santa Clara	Cambrian Elementary	\$13,564
Santa Clara	Campbell Union Elementary	\$34,899
Santa Clara	Campbell Union High	\$339,048
Santa Clara	Cupertino Union	\$83,459
Santa Clara	East Side Union High	\$1,170,982
Santa Clara	Evergreen Elementary	\$59,951
Santa Clara	FRANKLIN-Mckinley ELEMENTARY	\$45,663

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Santa Clara	Fremont Union High	\$428,541
Santa Clara	Gilroy Unified	\$151,278
Santa Clara	Loma Prieta Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Clara	Los Altos Elementary	\$17,812
Santa Clara	Los Gatos Union Elementary	\$15,881
Santa Clara	Los Gatos-Saratoga Joint Union High	\$123,861
Santa Clara	Luther Burbank	\$10,000
Santa Clara	Milpitas Unified	\$182,654
Santa Clara	Moreland Elementary	\$22,108
Santa Clara	Morgan Hill Unified	\$174,448
Santa Clara	Mountain View Elementary	\$12,647
Santa Clara	Mountain View-Los Altos Union High	\$139,355
Santa Clara	Mt. Pleasant Elementary	\$15,495
Santa Clara	Oak Grove Elementary	\$64,344
Santa Clara	Orchard	\$10,000
Santa Clara	Palo Alto Unified	\$180,144
Santa Clara	San Jose Unified	\$547,527
Santa Clara	Santa Clara Unified	\$245,115
Santa Clara	Saratoga Union Elementary	\$12,116
Santa Clara	Sunnyvale Elementary	\$30,120
Santa Clara	Union Elementary	\$23,073
Santa Clara	Whisman Elementary	\$10,000
Santa Cruz	Live Oak Elementary	\$11,440
Santa Cruz	Pajaro Valley Unified	\$317,230
Santa Cruz	San Lorenzo Valley Unified	\$76,267
Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz City High	\$255,590
Santa Cruz	Scotts Valley Unified	\$10,000
Santa Cruz	Soquel Union Elementary	\$12,888
Shasta	Anderson Union High	\$124,344
Shasta	Bella Vista Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Black Butte Union Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Cascade Union Elementary	\$10,861
Shasta	Castle Rock Union Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Columbia Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Cottonwood Union Elementary	\$10,000

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Shasta	Enterprise Elementary	\$20,000
Shasta	Fall River Joint Unified	\$32,872
Shasta	Gateway Unified	\$77,570
Shasta	Grant Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Happy Valley Union Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Igo, Ono, Platina Union Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Indian Springs Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Junction Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Millville Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Mountain Union Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	North Cow Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Pacheco Union Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Redding Elementary	\$22,204
Shasta	Shasta Union Elementary	\$10,000
Shasta	Shasta Union High	\$250,618
Shasta	Whitmore Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sierra	Sierra-Plumas Joint Unified	\$47,739
Siskiyou	Big Springs Union Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Butte Valley Unified	\$20,000
Siskiyou	Butteville Union Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Delphic Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Dunsmuir Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Etna Union High	\$21,191
Siskiyou	Forks Of Salmon Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Gazelle Union Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Grenada Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Happy Camp Union Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Hornbrook Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Junction Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Klamath River Union Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Mccloud UNION ELEMENTARY	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Montague Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Mt. Shasta Union	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Quartz Valley Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Sawyers Bar Elementary	\$10,000

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Siskiyou	Siskiyou Union High	\$48,125
Siskiyou	Weed Union Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Willow Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Yreka Union Elementary	\$10,000
Siskiyou	Yreka Union High	\$48,704
Solano	Benicia Unified	\$106,725
Solano	Dixon Unified	\$65,358
Solano	Fairfield-Suisun Unified	\$370,086
Solano	Travis Unified	\$78,535
Solano	Vacaville Unified	\$260,079
Solano	Vallejo City Unified	\$360,818
Sonoma	Cloverdale Unified	\$30,314
Sonoma	Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified	\$144,665
Sonoma	Forestville Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Fort Ross Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Geyserville Unified	\$15,000
Sonoma	Gravenstein Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Guerneville Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Harmony Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Healdsburg Unified	\$64,103
Sonoma	Horicon Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Monte Rio Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Montgomery Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Oak Grove Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Petaluma Joint Union High	\$204,810
Sonoma	Santa Rosa High, City Of	\$488,879
Sonoma	Sebastopol Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	Sonoma Valley Unified	\$93,885
Sonoma	Twin Hills Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sonoma	West Sonoma County Union High	\$128,881
Sonoma	Windsor Unified	\$51,842
Stanislaus	Ceres Unified	\$165,470
Stanislaus	Chatom Union Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Denair Unified	\$24,473
Stanislaus	Empire Union	\$20,273

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Stanislaus	Gratton Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Hart-Ransom Union Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Hickman Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Hughson Unified	\$46,243
Stanislaus	Knights Ferry Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Modesto City Elementary	\$88,769
Stanislaus	Modesto City High	\$654,107
Stanislaus	Newman-Crows Landing Unified	\$35,720
Stanislaus	Oakdale Joint Unified	\$94,851
Stanislaus	Paradise Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Patterson Joint Unified	\$64,103
Stanislaus	Riverbank Unified	\$64,730
Stanislaus	Roberts Ferry Union Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Salida Union	\$10,378
Stanislaus	Shiloh Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Stanislaus Union Elementary	\$14,674
Stanislaus	Sylvan Union Elementary	\$35,430
Stanislaus	Turlock Joint Elementary	\$37,651
Stanislaus	Turlock Joint Union High	\$178,165
Stanislaus	Valley Home Joint Elementary	\$10,000
Stanislaus	Waterford Elementary	\$10,000
Sutter	Brittan Elementary	\$10,000
Sutter	Browns Elementary	\$10,000
Sutter	East Nicolaus Joint Union High	\$12,357
Sutter	Franklin Elementary	\$37,651
Sutter	Live Oak Unified	\$32,631
Sutter	Marcum-Illinois Union	\$10,000
Sutter	Meridian Elementary	\$10,000
Sutter	Pleasant Grove Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
Sutter	Sutter Union High	\$31,569
Sutter	Winship Elementary	\$10,000
Sutter	Yuba City Unified	\$188,205
Tehama	Antelope Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Bend Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Corning Union Elementary	\$10,523

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Tehama	Corning Union High	\$46,677
Tehama	Elkins Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Evergreen Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Flournoy Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Gerber Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Kirkwood Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Lassen View Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Los Molinos Unified	\$25,000
Tehama	Manton Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Mineral Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Plum Valley Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Red Bluff Joint Union High	\$98,954
Tehama	Red Bluff Union Elementary	\$12,695
Tehama	Reeds Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Tehama	Richfield Elementary	\$10,000
Trinity	Cox Bar Elementary	\$10,000
Trinity	Douglas City Elementary	\$10,000
Trinity	Junction City Elementary	\$10,000
Trinity	Lewiston Elementary	\$10,000
Trinity	Mountain Valley Unified	\$20,000
Trinity	Southern Trinity Joint Unified	\$20,000
Trinity	Trinity Center Elementary	\$10,000
Trinity	Trinity Union High	\$25,487
Trinity	Weaverville Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Allensworth Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Alpaugh Unified	\$10,000
Tulare	Alta Vista Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Buena Vista Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Burton	\$12,454
Tulare	Columbine Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Cutler-Orosi Unified	\$61,593
Tulare	Dinuba Unified	\$92,196
Tulare	Ducor Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Earlimart Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Exeter Union Elementary	\$10,764

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Tulare	Exeter Union High	\$59,372
Tulare	Farmersville Unified	\$28,045
Tulare	Hope Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Hot Springs Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Kings River Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Liberty Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Lindsay Unified	\$58,600
Tulare	Monson-Sultana Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Oak Valley Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Outside Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Palo Verde Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Pixley Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Porterville Elementary	\$287,979
Tulare	Richgrove Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Rockford Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Saucelito Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Sequoia Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Springville Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Stone Corral Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Strathmore Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Strathmore Union High	\$22,880
Tulare	Sundale Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Sunnyside Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Terra Bella Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Three Rivers Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Tipton Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Traver Joint Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Tulare City Elementary	\$34,513
Tulare	Tulare Joint Union High	\$200,031
Tulare	Visalia Unified	\$438,485
Tulare	Waukena Joint Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Woodlake Union Elementary	\$10,000
Tulare	Woodlake Union High	\$35,189
Tulare	Woodville Elementary	\$10,000
Tuolumne	Bellevue Elementary	\$10,000

**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Tuolumne	Big Oak Flat-Groveland Unified	\$20,000
Tuolumne	Columbia Union	\$10,000
Tuolumne	Curtis Creek Elementary	\$10,000
Tuolumne	Jamestown Elementary	\$10,000
Tuolumne	Sonora	\$10,000
Tuolumne	Sonora Union High	\$84,183
Tuolumne	Soulsbyville Elementary	\$10,000
Tuolumne	Summerville Elementary	\$10,000
Tuolumne	Summerville Union High	\$39,195
Tuolumne	Twain Harte-Long Barn Union	\$15,000
Ventura	Briggs Elementary	\$10,000
Ventura	Conejo Valley Unified	\$372,934
Ventura	Fillmore Unified	\$64,392
Ventura	Hueneme Elementary	\$39,678
Ventura	Mesa Union Elementary	\$10,000
Ventura	Moorpark Unified	\$127,529
Ventura	Mupu Elementary	\$10,000
Ventura	Oak Park Unified	\$54,545
Ventura	Ocean View Elementary	\$12,840
Ventura	Ojai Unified	\$80,321
Ventura	Oxnard Elementary	\$69,412
Ventura	Oxnard Union High	\$682,007
Ventura	Pleasant Valley	\$37,844
Ventura	Rio Elementary	\$15,350
Ventura	Santa Paula Elementary	\$18,729
Ventura	Santa Paula Union High	\$75,060
Ventura	Simi Valley Unified	\$361,880
Ventura	Somis Union Elementary	\$10,000
Ventura	Ventura Unified	\$307,190
Yolo	Davis Joint Unified	\$148,816
Yolo	Esparto Unified	\$18,391
Yolo	Washington Unified	\$99,291
Yolo	Winters Joint Unified	\$40,499
Yolo	Woodland Joint Unified	\$172,565
Yuba	Camptonville Union Elementary	\$10,000



**School Safety and Violence Prevention Program  
1999-2000  
Districts**

<b>County</b>	<b>Local Educational Agency</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Yuba	Marysville Joint Unified	\$170,103
Yuba	Plumas Elementary	\$10,000
Yuba	Wheatland Elementary	\$10,000
Yuba	Wheatland Union High	\$30,265
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$99,999,397</b>



## STUDENT LEADERSHIP

**Program Description and Goals:** The Student Leadership Grant Program provides \$1,000-\$5,000 mini-grants to California public high schools for strategies initiated by students, in partnership with an adult facilitator, to achieve and maintain a safe and healthy school site that is free of violence.

The goal of this program is to actively engage high school students—including those attending alternative high schools, continuation high schools, and juvenile court and community schools—in youth development and positive leadership activities. A broad representation of all students, including those typically not involved in traditional school activities, are strongly encouraged to be included in project planning and implementation.

**Statutory Authority:** Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, Title IV, Improving America's School Act (IASA)

**Funding Source, Amount, and Time Period:** Federal Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act, Title IV, IASA, Discretionary Technical Assistance allocation provides \$120,000 per year. Funding is ongoing.

**Population Served:** Directly served clientele of the Student Leadership Grant Program are students primarily in grades 9-12. During the 1999-2000 school year, more than 29,000 students received direct services as a result of the program.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** Self-evaluations provide information regarding program operational difficulties which lead to program improvements in future years and provide information about program successes which can be shared with other programs.

**Contact Person:** Bonnie Williamson, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 324-6159;  
e-mail: bwilliam@cde.ca.gov

**Student Leadership Grants  
1999-2000**

<b>County</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	Oakland USD	Dewey High School	\$5,000
Alameda	San Leandro USD	San Leandro High School	\$3,700
El Dorado	Black Oak Mine USD	Golden Sierra High School	\$3,760
Fresno	Parlier USD	San Joaquin Valley High School	\$5,000
Humboldt	Eureka City Schools	Zoe Barnum High School	\$5,000
Kern	Mojave USD	Mojave High School	\$5,000
Lake	Konocti USD	W. C. Carle High School	\$3,657
Los Angeles	Culver City USD	Culver City High School	\$4,800
Los Angeles	San Gabriel USD	Gabrielino High School	\$5,000
Los Angeles	Walnut Valley USD	Del Paso Continuation School	\$4,700
Mendocino	Willits USD	Willits High School	\$4,050
Modoc	Modoc COE	Stronghold School	\$2,340
Orange	Brea Olinda USD	Brea Canyon High School	\$2,500
Riverside	Lake Elsinore USD	Ortega High School	\$3,534
Riverside	Riverside USD	Arlington High School	\$4,234
Riverside	Riverside USD	John W. North High School	\$5,000
Riverside	Riverside USD	Riverside Poly High School	\$4,975
Sacramento	Center USD	McClellan High School	\$1,489
San Bernardino	Chaffey Joint Union HSD	Alta Loma High School	\$5,000
San Bernardino	Chino Valley USD	Don Antonio Lugo High School	\$5,000
San Bernardino	Chino Valley USD	Ruben S. Ayala High School	\$4,986
San Bernardino	San Bernardino City USD	Cajon High School	\$5,000
San Diego	San Dieguito Union HSD	Torrey Pines High School	\$5,000
San Francisco	San Francisco Unified	Wallenberg Traditional High School	\$3,000
San Joaquin	Lodi USD	Plaza Robles High School	\$1,905
Solano	Vallejo City USD	Vallejo High School	\$4,670
Sonoma	Cotati-Rohnert Park USD	Phoenix High School	\$4,000
Sonoma	West Sonoma County UHSD	El Molino High School	\$2,700
Tulare	Tulare Joint Union HSD	Tulare Western High School	\$5,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$120,000</b>

## TARGETED TRUANCY AND PUBLIC SAFETY

**Program Description:** Assembly Bill 3492 (Chapter 200, Statutes of 1996, Frusetta) provided \$10 million in local assistance funds to be distributed to California school districts and county offices of education for developing and implementing strategies that will end each participating high-risk youth's pattern of truancy, antisocial behavior, and delinquency. The program focus is on youth who are 15 years of age or younger, who have been declared a ward of the juvenile court for the first time or who have been placed under the supervision of the county probation department, pursuant to Section 654 of the *Welfare and Institutions Code*, **and** who meet specific risk factors (i.e., poor school behavior and performance, family problems, substance abuse, and delinquent behavior).

This demonstration program provided authorization for 100 percent matching grants over a three-year period with a cap of \$1.25 million per applicant for the grant period. Successful grant applicants demonstrated the capacity to coordinate multiagency collaborative strategies that reduce the number of truants and thereby reduce the opportunities for youth to become involved in criminal activity, especially during school hours. The collaboration efforts of school districts and county offices of education must include, at minimum, local probation departments, and may also involve health services providers, local law enforcement agencies, mental health agencies, county and local school attendance review boards, truancy mediation programs, pupil support teams, and community-based organizations. The grantees are:

Humboldt COE (\$1,011,619)	Sacramento City USD (\$1,089,343)
Los Angeles USD (\$1,104,155)	San Diego City USD (\$901,034)
Merced City Elementary SD (\$467,403)	Santa Barbara HSD (\$1,016,614)
Modesto City Elementary SD (\$1,139,196)	Solano COE (\$995,671)
Orange COE (\$1,145,977)	West Contra Costa USD (\$1,143,061)

**Statutory Authority:** Assembly Bill 3492, Chapter 200, Statutes of 1996 amended *Education Code* section 48700 authorizing \$10 million one-time local assistance funds for Targeted Truancy and Public Safety (TTPS) Grants. State funds support the evaluation and staff for the programs beginning June 15, 1997 and ending July 30, 2000. Specific funding amounts include:

- **Targeted Truancy Grants:** \$10,000,000 three-year demonstration program grants, for up to \$1,250,000, are available to school districts and county offices of education.
- **Targeted Truancy Evaluation:** \$133,000
- **Targeted Truancy Administration:** \$442,000 (over a four-year period of time)

**Population Served:** Youth identified for the program specifically are high-risk youth, generally in middle schools, who meet specific risk factors (i.e., poor school behavior and performance, family problems, substance abuse, and delinquent behavior).

**Number of Youth Served:** The final report summarizing data for all 10 projects will be submitted to the Legislature March 2001. Summary results from reports submitted to date reflect a total of 748 students receiving specific and intense services.

**Evaluation for Effectiveness:** The enabling legislation requires evaluation using an experimental-control group design. Grant recipients assign potential participants to an experimental group that receives TTPS services or a control group that receives traditional services through the juvenile justice system. The program's effectiveness will be assessed by measuring differences between the two groups on several outcome measures including: grade point average; number of school days attended; number of trancies, suspensions, and expulsions reported; number of arrests; and number of court proceedings.

The Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI) has contracted to conduct the evaluation. Although the final report and findings are not due until September 2000, the interim findings indicate that the experimental group has shown significant decreases in the number of arrests and trancies and significant improvement in attendance and grade level progression.

**Benefits/Outcomes:** Habitual truancy carries a prohibitively high price tag for both youth and society. Low wages, chronic unemployment, reliance on public assistance for support, delinquency, crime and incarceration describe the life of great numbers of Californians who were once truant.

The collaborative nature of the TTPS brings together juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention programs, schools, law enforcement, county probation, mental health and social services, child welfare, family preservation programs, and community-based organizations to work together to address early indicators of juvenile delinquency.

In addition to the youth served in this program, families of high-risk youth also receive services. Local programs provide supervision, structure, and support to youth and their families; hold youth accountable for their actions; help youth develop awareness and sensitivity for the impact of their actions on other people and situations; promote and develop positive social values, behaviors, and relationships; and provide a continuum of follow-up services.

Youth and family needs are met in a holistic, rather than a categorical, manner by integrating services and strategies into existing systems that connect probation, education, and community resources. These systems include county and local school attendance review boards, truancy mediation programs, and pupil support teams. The TTPS Program shows students in the experimental group have increased the mean grade point average and have improved attendance. Those students who participated progressed to the next grade level and received more appropriate school placement. Behavior and risk profile improved between intake and outcome. Such behavior change may have been a result of program staff being better able to assess non-academic problems as they develop deeper relationships with the participants.

**Contact Person:** Vivian Linfor, Education Programs Consultant, (916) 323-1028;  
e-mail: vlinfor@cde.ca.gov